HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XLIII APRIL, 1950 NUMBER 2

THE DISPUTATION OF BARCELONA (1263)

CECIL ROTH

OXFORD UNIVERSITY

CHRONOLOGICAL SCHEME OF THE DISPUTATION OF BARCELONA

Friday, July 20th 1263.	First Session.
Monday July 23rd.	Second Session.
Thursday July 26th.	Third Session.
Friday July 27th.	Fourth Session.
Saturday, August 4th.	Encounter in Synagogue.
August 9th–12th.	*King Jaime at Villafranca*: Nahmanides returns to Gerona.
Between August 28th and 30th.	*Latin Protocol drawn up.*
August 26th–29th.	*Regulations enforcing conversionist sermons and censorship of Hebrew Books.*
April (?) 1265.	Nahmanides sentenced.
April 12th 1265.	Reaccused, he appears at Court, and the sentence is revoked: the Dominicans appeal to Rome.
1266	Pope Clement IV. orders King of Aragon to take action against Nahmanides.
Summer 1267.	Nahmanides reaches Palestine.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

The principal authorities for the story of the Disputation of Barcelona are the Latin protocol published by Jaime Villanueva, Viaje literario a las iglesias de España, xiii. (Madrid, 1850) pp. 332–5: C. Girbal, Los judios en Gerona (Gerona, 1870) pp. 66–8; and, from a better MS., F. Baer in the Hebrew periodical Tarbitz ii. (Jerusalem, 1931) 185–7. The Hebrew account by Nahmanides was first published from an exceptionally poor Germanized recension (which confuses the names of

the interlocutors, and frequently interposes abusive expressions) by J. C. Wagenseil in his Tela Ignea Satanae (Altdorf, 1681) ii. 24–60, with Latin translation: it was reprinted in Milhemet Hovah (Constantinople, 1710). A scientific edition based on two fairly reliable MSS. was produced by M. Steinschneider under the Latin title Nachmanidis Disputatio Publica pro fide Judaica (Stettin-Berlin, 1860): reprinted by R. Margoliouth (Lemberg, 192–) and, with many errors, by J. D. Eisenstein in his Ozar Vikhuhim ('Corpus of Disputations,' New York, 1928), pp. 86–94.

The following are the more important articles devoted to the Disputation: — P. Denifle, Quellen zur Disputation Pablos Christiani mit Moses Nachmani zu Barcelona, 1263, in Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft, viii (1887) 225–244; M. Kayserling, Die Disputation des Bonastruc mit Fra Pablo in Barcelona, in Monatschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums xiv. 308–313; H. Graetz, Die Disputation des Bonastruc mit fra Pablo in Barcelona, ibid., xiv. 428–433; I. Loeb, La Controverse de 1263 à Barcelone entre Paulus Christiani et Moise ben Nahman, in Revue des Etudes Juives, xv (1887), 1–18: F. (I.) Baer, Contribution to the Study of the Controversies of R. Jehiel of Paris and R. Moses ben Nahman (Hebrew) in Tarbitz, ii. 172–187: and J. Mª Millás Vallicrosa, Sobre las fuentes documentales de la controversia de Barcelona en el año 1263 in Anales de la Universidad de Barcelona, Memorias y comunicaciones, 1940, pp. 25–44.

Of the Judaeo-Christian disputations which were staged publicly from time to time during the Middle Ages, perhaps none was of greater interest, and certainly none was recorded more intimately, than that which took place at Barcelona in the summer of 1263. The contest was under the auspices of Jaime I, King of Aragon, one of the outstanding figures of thirteenth century history, most of the sessions being held in his palace. The Jewish spokesman was Rabbi Moses ben Nahman (Nahmanides), of Gerona, Talmudist, cabbalist and philosopher, then in his seventieth year, the most profound scholar of Spanish Jewry in his day. The foremost figure on the side opposed to him was Fray Pablo (Pau) Cristiá,[1] a convert from Judaism who, though not a salient personality, was by no means ill-versed in certain aspects of Jewish lore, and may be said to have introduced a new element into

[1] This is the form used in recent Spanish historical literature: the customary 'Pablo Christiani' is an impossible hybrid.

Judaeo-Christian polemic. Among those present were several Christian theologians of great repute, one of whom was to be canonized in due course. The setting could hardly have been more impressive.

Two accounts of the controversy have been preserved. One is a brief official Latin protocol (perhaps a clumsy abridgement of a longer document), recounting what had happened, from the Christian point of view, in a highly succinct form. This, endorsed by the royal sign-manual, is preserved in two copies, in the Archives of the Crown of Aragon and the Cathedral of Gerona respectively. The other is the more detailed Hebrew record, set down a little time after the event by Nahmanides himself. Much has been written about the discrepancies between the two, by Christian or Jewish scholars who have championed the one or the other version. But, as it seems to the present writer, this is a superfluous labor. There can of course be no doubt that the Hebrew account goes into much detail which the Latin overlooks: the latter for example does not trouble to mention [2] the fact that the disputation continued over several days — a point concerning which Nahmanides is certainly reliable — and in consequence runs certain arguments together or reverses their order. But, except for this, the two stories are basically in agreement,[3] with the inevitable reservation that each writer was convinced that his cause emerged wholly victorious. For it is preposterous to expect from these records of seven centuries ago a standard of veracity that one so seldom encounters, or even (it may be) demonstrates, in similar circumstances today. There can therefore be no doubt that each writer recorded to some extent not only what was said, but also what he wished had been said; that a muttered repartee to which perhaps no attention was paid is represented as having triumphantly clinched an argument: that failure to answer some point because it was not heard, or because it was considered unimportant, was construed as a reduction to silence. All this notwithstanding, the two accounts dovetail closely; and it seems worth while to attempt to reconstruct the scene, reproducing on

[2] Except perhaps in a single phrase, towards the end: 'et esset pluries publice confusus.'

[3] In some cases the verbal correspondence is remarkable: e.g. the Hebrew phrase גנן ערן שבארץ renders literally the Latin *in paradiso terrestri.*

the basis of both documents the give and take of arguments which picture so vividly the intellectual atmosphere of the time.

Of Pablo Cristiá's Jewish antecedents, we know virtually nothing, except that he was probably a native of Montpellier and a pupil of Rabbi Eliezer of Tarascon: it is thought that as a Jew he had been known as Saul, but this is hypothetical.[4] He was converted to Christianity as a young man, and is conjectured[5] (on slender grounds, indeed) to have joined the Dominicans as early as 1229. This Order, founded to combat the Albigensian heresy, had soon turned its attention against infidelity (on the part of non-Christians, that is) as well. From the middle of the thirteenth century, it had begun to exert pressure upon the Jews and Moslems in the kingdom of Aragon (which then extended over a great part of Provence) sending Friars among them to deliver conversionist sermons. Under the auspices of Fray Ramón de Penyafort (Peñaforte), formerly Master General of the Order, and still in his semi-retirement at Barcelona a leading figure in its counsels, a new intellectual approach had been initiated. Conversion was to be achieved 'by faith, reason and enticement — not by harsh dealing.' Hence, the systematic study by the Friars, first of Arabic, then of Hebrew, was organized: the object being in the latter case 'to refute the spite and errors of the Jews, who can no longer as aforetime presumptuously deny the true text, and the interpretation of their own scholars of earlier days' — a significant phrase, in view of the subsequent developments that are to engage our attention. Pablo Cristiá, with his Jewish background and with a burning conviction that he had discovered the true way of redemption, began to take a leading part in this work: he is perhaps identical indeed with the apostate named Paul, leader of a campaign against his former coreligionists, to confute whom Rabbi Jacob of 'Venezia' (more probably, Valencia [or Valence?]) wrote at this time an extremely interesting polemical letter replete with historical detail.[6]

After a while, Fray Pablo crossed the Pyrenees into Aragon. At Gerona, he pitted himself against the most eminent of the local

[4] [Neubauer-] Renan, Les Rabbins Français du commencement du quatorzième siècle, pp. 562–571.

[5] Lukyn Williams, Adversus Judaeos, p. 244.

[6] Revue des Etudes Juives, lxxxii, 363–378.

Jewish scholars, Rabbi Moses ben Nahman (Nahmanides) known in the outside world as Maestre Bonastrug de Porta, then at the height of his fame: [7] and they argued together at some length (perhaps more than once) concerning the Holy Trinity and the Unity of the Divine Essence.[8] But this was not sufficient for him: confident in his somewhat limited learning, he desired a public disputation, in which he was convinced that he would be able to discomfit his adversary and strike a notable blow for the true faith. He appealed accordingly to the King of Aragon, Jaime I, who though only fifty-five years old had already been on the throne for half a century. A remarkable combination of intellectual curiosity, moral laxity, and religious fervor, he was not loath to arrange this and enjoined Nahmanides to do what was requested of him. The latter signified that he on his side was willing, provided that he was accorded complete freedom of speech both by the King and by Ramón de Penyafort (who was to take a leading part in the proceedings) for the Dominicans. The latter attempted to impose the condition that nothing should be said against the Christian faith, which was above question. But the Rabbi objected; he could not admit, he said, that his opponents should be permitted to decide what was objectionable, though he could be trusted not to overstep the bounds of good taste. Fray Pablo thereupon agreed for the purposes of the controversy to consider Christianity as doubtful, so as to undermine the confidence of the Jews, who would maintain that their champion could answer all the arguments brought against him if only he were freely permitted to do so. The King, of course, confirmed these conditions.

Thus the controversy opened, apparently on July 20th, 1263,[9]

[7] There is an excellent treatment of Nahmanides' life and teachings in Schechter's Studies in Judaism, i, 120–172, a German monograph by H. Chone, and a recent biographical sketch in Hebrew by I. Unna. He had been in amicable relations with Jaime before the Disputation: see Régné, Catalogue (below, note 33), no. 137 — grant by the King of certain revenues to Bonastrug de Porta, Master of the Jews of Gerona.

[8] This is referred to briefly in the Latin protocol, and in some detail in Nahmanides' account of his discussion with the Christian protagonists in Synagogue after the disputation.

[9] This is the only date given in the Latin protocol, which however does not indicate that the discussions lasted over more than one day: it is generally assumed therefore to be that of the opening session. This was a Friday, not a Monday as

in the Royal Palace of Barcelona. It appears from the reports that Fray Pablo brought with him for reference a store of Hebrew books, which were at hand when needed. The language used was probably Catalan (one or two words of which figure in the Hebrew account) but may have been Latin, with which Nahmanides was certainly acquainted. Among those who were present and took part in the proceedings,[10] besides the King himself and San Ramón de Penyafort, were Fray Arnaldo de Segarra, another outstanding member of the Dominican order, and the Franciscan Fray Pere (Pedro) of Genoa who, whether from the mildness associated traditionally with the Minorites or from opposition to the rival body, showed himself far more amicably inclined towards the Jewish representative. Besides these there were several barons, prelates, knights and members of religious orders, as well as a number of learned Jews.

The reason for Nahmanides' insistence on complete freedom of speech soon became apparent. He saw no point, he said, in the disputations formerly held from time to time regarding incidental religious observances; on this occasion, in the royal court, he wished to have attention directed to the fundamentals of creed and the essential differences between the two faiths. It was thereupon agreed to concentrate on the following main subjects: —

(i) Whether the Messiah had already come (as the Christians held) or was still to come (as the Jews held).

(ii) Whether according to prophecy the Messiah was to be both God and Man at the same time. (The Latin protocol adds, as an inde-

---

stated by Loeb (Revue des Etudes Juives, xv. 4–5). The second session, held according to Nahmanides on the following Monday, was therefore on July 23rd, and not as Loeb says on the 27th; the third on Thursday, 26th July, not the 30th; and the fourth on Friday, 27th July, not the 31st. Other texts of the account indeed give the days of the last three sessions as Sunday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, in which case a slight adjustment is to be made; but, since Nahmanides explicitly states that he remained in Barcelona for *eight* days after the close of the Disputation, in order to be present in Synagogue on the following Saturday week, the last session must have been on a Friday. In any case, Loeb's reckoning, followed by all later writers (and used as the basis for various complicated arguments which fundamentally affect the veracity of the story) is incorrect.

[10] It is almost certain, but is nowhere stated explicitly, that the Dominican scholar Ramón Marti (Raymondo Martini), whose name is of such importance in the subsequent history of Judaeo-Christian controversy (see below), was also present. For Penyafort's participation, see F. Vals Taberna, San Ramón de Penyafort, Barcelona 1940, pp. 131–139.

pendent point of discussion, making four in all: whether or not the Messiah, who had appeared, suffered and died for the sake of mankind.)

(iii) Whether the ceremonial practises of the Jewish religion should still be observed. (The Latin adds: or should have ceased after the coming of the Messiah.)

Nahmanides cheerfully accepted these points for discussion; in order to maintain his case he was prepared, he said, to remain at Barcelona for a day, for a week, for a month, even for a whole year.

Fray Pablo had promised to draw his arguments solely from the scriptures and other writings, the authenticity of which was admitted by the Jews themselves. By this he meant the Talmudic literature in its widest sense. At the time of the 'Disputation' (really Inquisitional Prosecution) held in Paris in 1240, when Nicholas Donin and Rabbi Jehiel had been the protagonists, the Talmud had been condemned to be burned as blasphemous; but in consequence of the new Dominican policy, the Christian polemists had by now modified their position and maintained that the work in question contained evidence to the Messiahship of Jesus and the fundamental truth of Christianity, which the Jews — *deliberate* unbelievers — wilfully neglected or suppressed.[11] To put it in another way,[12] they 'appealed from the Jews of . . . [that] day to the Jews of Talmudic times, and argued that these had accepted some of the great Christian facts, although they rejected their application.' At the very outset, Fray Pablo made his point, affirming that the Rabbis themselves had believed in Jesus — not only as the Messiah, but as both Man and God. Very pertinently, Nahmanides asked why they did not say so explicitly in the Talmud, which was compiled long after the time of Jesus; and why they remained Jews. The other told him that he was trying to overwhelm the disputation with his long-windedness (which indeed seems to have been the Rabbi's failing), and immediately passed to his main point: the familiar crux of Judaeo-Christian controversy (Genesis xlix.10): *Non auferetur sceptrum de Iuda* . . . .

[11] See my article, The Medieval Conception of the Jew; a new Interpretation, in Linda Miller Memorial volume, New York, 1938; the point has since been developed further by J. Trachtenberg, The Devil and the Jews, New Haven, 1943.

[12] Lukyn Williams, Adversus Judaeos, p. 247.

The sceptre had departed from Judah, he said; therefore the Messiah (*Shiloh*) had already come. To this, Nahmanides opposed an orthodox Jewish interpretation: that so long as Kingship continued in Israel, it resided in the tribe of Judah, and when it is renewed, it will be renewed in the tribe of Judah. In fact, in Jesus' day there had been for centuries no King of that house, except for the brief rule of Zerubbabel (!) after the return from the Babylonian captivity. The friar parried adroitly. Though the institution of Kingship had not continued up to the time of Jesus, there were nevertheless constituted authorities of the House of David — the Patriarch in Palestine, the Exilarch in Babylonia: their supremacy being manifested in the institution of Rabbinical Ordination, which they continued to exercise. That no longer existed. Today therefore no one has the right to call himself a Rabbi or Master (*Mestre*) — not even you, he concluded inconsequentially, rounding on his opponent.[13] Nahmanides modestly agreed: 'I am no master, nor even a scholar,' he said. The opposing side took a most unfair advantage of this false humility, and the Latin protocol begins its report with this triumph: 'It was demonstrated to him that he should not be called "Magister," because no Jew should be thus called after the Passion of Christ.'

The discussion now became centred on a purely historical point, regarding which both sides were as it seems singularly ill-equipped to argue. Fray Pablo was under the grotesquely false impression that the Exilarchs of the Davidic house had maintained themselves in Babylon only during the seventy years of the First Exile (according to the Jewish tradition of his day they continued until the eleventh century, but in fact they dragged on an uninspired existence until the thirteenth, if not later): he apparently imagined too that the Palestinian Patriarchate ended at the time of the fall of Jerusalem in the year 70 (in fact, it had hardly started then, and was abolished only in 425). Nahmanides

[13] This was one of Christiá's more specious arguments (though he was badly confused about the dates, as will be seen), but was based on an utter misunderstanding. The ceremony of Ordination practised in Talmudic times, which fell in abeyance with the decay of the Palestinian Jewish centre in the fifth century, conferred judicial powers, and had little to do with rabbinical functions in the modern sense.

on his side was at pains to show that at present there was not a breach in the institution of the Jewish Kingship, but only an intermission, as there had been once before, during the period of the Babylonian exile. Against this, the Friar maintained that, since the Exilarchs held dominion at that time, the tradition was then unbroken, which was not the case subsequently. The Jewish spokesman rejoined, quite correctly, that such authority had in fact continued in Israel long after, down to some 500 or 800 [14] years since. 'But he brought no proof of this. . . . Hence it is clear that the Messiah has come, for Authority cannot lie,' concludes the Latin protocol, utterly at fault on this matter. In the Hebrew, on the other hand, the Jewish representative demonstrates at this point that the judicial authority of the Exilarchs did not imply that they enjoyed *royal* authority; while Fray Pere of Genoa, the Franciscan representative, intervened to point out that there could have been a seventy-year intermission (he is quoted as using the vernacular word, *vagar*) in the holding of the sceptre by Judah without contravening prophecy. 'You see, Fray Pere agrees with me,' cried Nahmanides, triumphantly; but the other refused to go so far, for to the Rabbi's distress ('You are changing your mind now,' the latter said) he refused to admit, not illogically, that an interruption of a thousand years fell in the same category as one of seventy.

The Friar's next argument was taken, as he had promised, from the Talmudical literature. In this vast inchoate mass of dicta, frequently wholly casual, it is not difficult to find evidence for the most conflicting views; and he triumphantly adduced an imaginative passage from the Midrash on Lamentations (i.16) which tells how, on the day of the Destruction of Jerusalem, a Jewish ploughman was told by a passing Arab, first that the Temple had been destroyed, and then, immediately after, that the Messiah had been born. (This is ostensibly based on the juxtaposition of Isaiah x.34 and xi.1: 'And Lebanon [*sc.* the Temple] shall fall by a mighty one. And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse.') To the general surprise, Nahmanides declared that he did not believe in the veracity of this legend.

[14] The correct reading is given by Millás in Anales de la Universidad de Barcelona, 1940, p. 29.

One can imagine the air of triumph with which Fray Pablo turned to the King. 'See! he renounces their own sacred book,' he cried. The Rabbi retorted that the story had no doubt some hidden meaning; but even if it were accepted literally it proved his point, for Jesus had been born long before the destruction of the Temple — 200 years, according to the Jewish tradition,[15] 73 according to the Christian — so that the reference could not be to him.[16] A layman present at the disputation — Mestre Guillem, one of the royal judges — now caught him sharply up. They were discussing, he said, not whether Jesus was the Messiah, but whether the Messiah had come; and according to this statement he certainly had. Nahmanides qualified this scornfully as a typical lawyer's point, but had his answer ready: this text, taken literally, states only that the Messiah was born on that day, not that he had come: as in the case of Moses, many years would elapse between his birth and his mission.

A discussion now followed on the interpretation of the 'Suffering Servant' of Isaiah, concerning which Nahmanides wrote a separate short treatise.[17] He, of course, applied the chapter to Israel; to which his opponent objected that he could prove from the Rabbis themselves that it referred to the Messiah. Of course, Nahmanides replied, there were some Rabbis who gave this interpretation. None of them, however, considered that this passage implied that the Messiah was to be put to death and buried with the sinful (indeed, he added, Jesus was not buried).[18] The Christian audience were for their part satisfied by Pablo's arguments, and considered that Nahmanides had been refuted: *ipse vero*

[15] This curious reckoning is imposed by the confused Rabbinical legends according to which Jesus was a pupil of R. Joshua ben Perahia. This same alibi was used in the Disputation of Paris.

[16] The Latin protocol sums up this brush: concessit Christum sive Messiam, iam sunt transacti M (!) anni, natum in Bethlehem fuisse et exinde Romam aliquibus aparuisse. There is no mention of Bethlehem in Nahmanides' report, but in fact the place figures in the Midrashic legend, and his omission may have been intentional.

[17] Published by Neubauer [and Driver] in The Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah according to Jewish Interpreters (Oxford 1876) i. 75–81 (Translation in vol: ii) and by Steinschneider in appendix to his edition of the Disputation.

[18] Here the disputants touched incidentally upon the third topic of the agenda according to the Latin protocol (the sufferings of the Messiah), which was not formally discussed.

tandem coactus per auctoritates confessus est, quod de Christo intelligitur et exponitur.

Another Rabbinic legend now came up for consideration: the report ascribed to R. Joshua ben Levi (T. B. Sanhedrin 58a) that the Messiah was sitting in the citadel of Israel's enemies, at the gates of Rome: so he had already come and was in Rome, said Fray Pablo. Just the reverse, retorted the Rabbi; it is explicitly stated in these legends (though he did not personally put credence in them) that he was awaiting the call.

This was too much for the King to stomach. Intervening in the discussion for the first time, he said that if the Messiah had been born on the day of the Destruction of Jerusalem, he would now be more than a thousand years old, which was preposterous. Nahmanides pointed out that he was not obliged to argue with His Majesty, but only with Fray Pablo; however, both Adam and Methuselah had lived nearly a thousand years, which was sufficient answer. 'Where is the Messiah now, in that case?' enquired the monarch. 'That is no part of the subject under discussion,' replied Nahmanides; he added, laughing, that perhaps he was at the gates of Toledo, and suggested that a royal messenger should be sent post-haste to enquire. The session thus ended in an atmosphere of good humor.

On the following Monday,[19] the discussions were removed to one of the monasteries (cloisters) in the city (not necessarily that of S. Domingo, as some historians have stated), where the King had betaken himself. The report of what was happening had spread, and there was now a large audience, including Berenguer de Anglesola, bishop of the see, numerous priests, and several scholars belonging to the mendicant orders. Apparently, Nahmanides had been reconsidering his position over the Sabbath, and had realized that he had made a tactical error in allowing Talmudical legends to be discussed as evidences of fact. He began the proceedings, therefore, before Fray Pablo could speak, by explaining the nature of the Rabbinical literature, carefully distinguishing between the Talmud, which basically laid down the

[19] One MS. reads Sunday (this would perhaps explain why the session took place in a monastery): there is a similar discrepancy as regards the following sessions, as has been pointed out.

law, and the Midrash, which he qualified as mere sermons (he uses the vernacular word), or stories (*ragionamento*, he says, in Italian) which one could believe or no. As a matter of fact, it is improbable that this rationalistic approach really represented the views of this pious mystic. Moreover, the impression that he gave the Christians was that he renounced the authority of the Rabbinic passages which proved Fray Pablo's case. On the other hand, he continued to maintain that even if the legends were interpreted literally, they could not apply to Jesus, as the dates did not tally. And he pointed out that it would not be surprising for the Messiah to live a thousand years, or even eternally, for unlike Adam he is sinless: without doubt, he was awaiting the call in the terrestrial Eden, whence the latter had been expelled for his transgression.

'But you said that he is in Rome,' the King reminded him.

'Not that he *is* in Rome, but that he *was* in Rome, on that particular occasion,' the Rabbi replied. (Later on, he explained to the King privately that the Messiah's business there was to destroy the sinful city of Israel's persecutors: but he did not wish to say so in public.)

He now passed over to the offensive, and asked whether, in the view of the Christians, Original Sin ended in the days of the Messiah. Both the King and Fray Pablo hastened to say that this was so, but not as he understood it: the Messiah, Jesus, had redeemed those who because of that sin had been sent to Hell. Impossible, said Nahmanides, God would never have condemned the righteous to punishment for the transgression of their ancestor; moreover, the recorded penalties for Adam's fall from Grace — the labor of agriculture, the pains of childbirth, and so on — still continue. No reply to this is recorded in the Latin protocol, but it is extremely unlikely that the argument can have passed unchallenged before an audience so learned in Christian theology.

Fray Pablo now wished to resume the discussion where it had been left off, and to bring evidence that the time for the advent of the Messiah was past, but Nahmanides would not let him proceed. In one of the most significant passages of the disputation, he demonstrated that the basic difference between Judaism and Christianity did not turn on the Messiah, this question not being

to Jews of such dogmatic importance as Christians imagine.[20] Indeed, he said, there was more merit in fulfilling the precepts of Judaism in the difficult circumstances of the Diaspora than in the ideal conditions of Messianic days; from this point of view the King of Aragon, whose good-will made it possible, was more important for the Jews than the Messiah, who too would be no more than a King of flesh and blood.[21] The vital difference between the two faiths lay not in this but in the Christian dogmas concerning the nature of God, the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection and so on, in which no Jew could bring himself to believe. Nevertheless, he was prepared to continue the discussion on the points his adversary had raised, if it was so desired. Rising once more, Fray Pablo now paraded further arguments, unrecorded in either version, though referred to in the Hebrew, proving the Messianic quality of Jesus of Nazareth. To this Nahmanides retorted that — though he was the only person who ever claimed, or was claimed, to be the Messiah [22]— he did not fulfil the Messianic prophecies of the Bible. Neither he, nor the Church after him, ever had dominion 'from sea to sea' (Psalms, lxxii.8); indeed, the Roman empire dwindled after the adoption of Christianity, and in the contemporary world Islam ruled over wider areas than Christendom. Moreover, the beating of 'swords into plowshares and spears into pruning-hooks' (Isaiah, ii.4) had not been accom-

[20] Schechter, ut supra, p. 128, elaborates this point, not too clearly expounded in Nahmanides' account of the Controversy, from a parallel in his work on the Time of the Redemption. (Ketz haGeulah) — then unpublished, now ed. J. Lipschitz, London 1909.

[21] For a more or less systematic exposition of Nahmanides' views on this subject, based to a great extent on his account of the Disputation, see J. Sarachek, The Doctrine of the Messiah in Medieval Jewish Literature (New York, 1932), pp. 162–169; the point is dealt with more succinctly in Lukyn Williams' summary treatment of the same subject in his Adversus Judaeos, chapter xxv (see in particular p. 246). Baer, however (in the article cited in the Bibliography, supra), points out that Nahmanides was guilty here of a contradiction, since at the beginning of the controversy he had agreed that precisely this question, whether or no the Messiah had come, was one of the fundamental subjects to be discussed.

[22] So both the Hebrew account and the Latin (which infers from this that the Rabbi admitted that, if it could be proved that the Messiah had come, he could not be other than Jesus). It is extraordinary that he did not recall the Messianic pretensions of Bar Kochba, recorded in the Talmud, or more recent claimants such as those mentioned by Maimonides in his Epistle to the Yemen. This curious absence of historical perspective is characteristic, though of the age rather than of the person.

plished, especially among the Christians: how unfortunate it would be for the King and his knights if man did 'not learn war any more' (Isaiah, ii.4), he added, sarcastically. As for the smiting of the earth 'with the rod of his mouth' (Isaiah, xi.4) — sometimes even the Christian hosts were, in fact, discomfited, notwithstanding their mail-covered steeds. The reply, whether adequate or no, was certainly over-lengthy, as Pablo grumbled when he came forward again with a question: and on this occasion the King himself bade the Rabbi give way.

The Friar's new argument was drawn from the Midrashic interpretation of Isaiah, lii.13: '*My servant shall be exalted* — more than Abraham; *and extolled* — more than Moses; *and be very high* — more than the servient angels.'[23] Could this be said of any other than Jesus? Certainly, retorted the Rabbi: much the same is stated in fact — with only a slight change of vocabulary — of Moses, of the righteous, indeed of all Israel. The significance of the Midrashic interpretation was, that when in the process of time the Messiah went to Rome to summon the Pope[24] and the rulers of the world to release the Jews from bondage, he would outdo even Moses, even the servient angels.

Fray Pablo was unwilling to hear any further exposition of this topic. He now turned to the Midrash which told how the Messiah was to pray for Israel and offer to undergo tribulation (as Jesus did) if God would resurrect their dead forthwith.[25] Now losing his temper, Nahmanides retorted that in fact this was not accomplished by Jesus, and that if he prayed to God he clearly was not God. The tribulation that the Messiah underwent according to

[23] The passage is to be found in Tanhuma, ed. Buber, Genesis, p. 139: but the disputants may have cited it from the mysterious Bereshith Rabbathi of Moses ha-Darshan of Narbonne; see S. Lieberman in his Shekiin [on the sources of Martini's Pugio Fidei], p. 79, and in Historia Judaica, v. 92; and Albeck in his appendix to Baer's article on the same subject from the contrary point of view in the Memorial Volume to Asher Gulak and S. Klein, p. 49, which should be taken in conjunction with Zunz's note, Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, ed. 1892, p. 303 [and now with A. Díaz Macho, Los midrasim de Raimundo Martí, in Sefarad, ix, 165–196].

[24] Nahmanides reverts to this point more than once. It was apparently the usual belief at the time, and in 1280 the mystic Abraham Abulafia actually acted upon it, attempting to present himself before Nicholas III to demand the release of the Jews from their captivity. (I do not think that he was necessarily influenced by the views expressed at Barcelona, which without doubt reflected prevailing opinions.)

[25] Cf. Pesikta Rabbathi ed. Friedmann, p. 161^{b} § 36: Midrash on Proverbs.

this legend was not physical, but resided in the fact that the deliverance of his people was delayed.

When he appealed to the Talmudic literature, in Nahmanides' presence, the Friar was obviously on somewhat unsure ground. He now reverted to the Bible. From the days of the convert Bodo and Pablo Alvarez, in the ninth century, the Seventy Weeks of Daniel (ix.24: 'Seventy Weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city') had been a habitual point of contention in Judaeo-Christian polemic in Spain, as was to be the case long afterwards. According to the Christian interpretation, which Pablo now put forward, the phrase implied 490 years, made up of the 70 years of the Babylonian Exile together with the 420 years of the Second Temple, after the lapse of which period 'everlasting righteousness' would begin, with the advent of Jesus. The chronology was of course hopelessly wrong, for from the Babylonian Exile to the birth of Jesus was a period of 597 years, and the Second Temple stood in fact for some 565 years. But this historical misapprehension was shared by, or rather taken over from, the erroneous Jewish tradition; for example, in the very early chronological compendium, Seder Olam, Daniel's reference is computed in precisely the same fashion, though of course with a different conclusion. The obvious reply was that Jesus manifested himself some years before the Destruction of Jerusalem, though Nahmanides unintentionally confused the issue by maintaining as before that he had appeared 210 years (i.e., thirty 'weeks') before the fall of Jerusalem; even, however, according to the 'erroneous' Christian reckoning there was a discrepancy of ten 'weeks' or 70 years. In Fray Pablo's opinion, of course, the slight margin of time had no significance; and it was moreover clear to him that the reference in the next verse of Daniel to 'the Messiah the Prince' was to Jesus. Jewish exegesis, on the other hand, refered it to Zerubbabel: and Nahmanides went into a long argument (set down at greater length than the circumstances of the Disputation can have allowed, though it must be admitted that he seems to have indulged in a prolixity that did his cause no good) to give his own interpretation of Daniel's prophecy, albeit he knew that it might scandalize some of his coreligionists: he believed this verse to point to the coming of the Messiah exactly 95

years later — that is, in the year 1358.[26] This led to a dispute between the two protagonists on the significance of the Hebrew word *iom*, which he interpreted for this purpose as 'Year.' Fray Pablo accused him of altering the meaning arbitrarily for his own purpose, in a way that no other person in the world would do, and asked the King to send out and bring in the first Jew who might be found in the street for the purpose of interrogation on this point. A bewildered Israelite was led in. 'What does the word *iom* in your language mean?' he was asked. '*Dia*,' he replied, naturally. 'This Jew may be qualified to sit in judgment on Fray Pablo, but not on me,' observed the Rabbi, sourly, as he adduced various passages from the Bible to show that the Hebrew word was sometimes used not only to signify a period, but even to signify the night. For once, he found support even in the ranks of his adversaries, for Fray Arnaldo de Segurra, one of the scholarly Dominicans present, pointed out that Jerome had interpreted the word 'days' in this passage as referring to the ages of the people.

Hoping to end the encounter on a triumphant note, Fray Pablo now cited another Midrashic legend which tells how the Messiah separated himself from his idolatrous ancestors, God therefore placing him in the Garden of Eden: to whom other than Jesus could this refer? This passage was certainly brought out of its context; and the Rabbi took the book from his adversary's hand and read out the full text, which enumerates those who were said to have entered Paradise in their lifetimes, including Serah daughter of Asher and Pharaoh's daughter: [27] were such women fit company for the son of God? he asked, scornfully. By now, the discussions had lasted long enough for that day; the King arose to leave, and the session was suspended.

The next session, the third, was three days later (probably on Thursday), and like the first was held in the royal palace, near the entrance. The King, disquieted perhaps by the acrimony that had been shown in the previous encounter, enjoined moderation on this occasion. Nahmanides evidently did not consider Fray

[26] Nahmanides devoted a separate treatise, Ketz haGeulah (see above) to this subject: cf. also L. I. Epstein, The Eschatology of Rabbi Moses ben Nachman, in Students' Annual of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1914, pp. 95–123.

[27] See Derekh Eretz Zutta, cap: 1, ad fin; Aleph-Beth of Ben Sira, ed. Berlin, p. 36^{b}. But an exact source cannot be traced.

Pablo's opening remarks to be worth recording. Perhaps it was now that (as incidentally mentioned elsewhere in both accounts) he repeated the arguments in support of the doctrine of the Trinity which he had adduced during their former encounter at Gerona, the three Persons representing according to him Wisdom, Will, Power: the Rabbi agreed that all these three were attributes of God, but argued that this does not constitute a Trinity. The King now interposed, pointing out that the attributes of wine exist without the wine, but are nonetheless united in it. Nahmanides retorted that God had other attributes besides — e.g., Truth, Life: would not this imply that there was a Quintuplity rather than a Trinity? This account leaves him triumphant, but it is hardly to be imagined that the eminent scholastics who were present could have been content for the matter to rest there. It may have been at this encounter too that, as the Latin protocol records, Fray Pablo 'silenced' his adversary by pointing out that the Talmud, on the authority of Psalm xcv.7 ('Today, if that ye would hearken to His voice') stated that the Messiah would come for the Jews only if they were obedient to the Divine will. The obvious corollary is that they were no longer the Chosen people. This would naturally [28] lead up to the thrust and parry recorded in the sixteenth century chronicle, Shebet Jehudah (§ xl) which tells how Fray Pablo had claimed that the Jews were now in the place of the Canaanites of old, having imitated their ways, while the Christians had taken the place of the Jews; and how the Rabbi rejoined that if that were so they would have inherited the Jewish attributes, such as the oracles and gift of prophecy.

Later, the Friar cited a new authority — the writings of Rabbi Moses of Egypt (i.e., Moses Maimonides) whom he qualified as the greatest scholar that the Jews had produced for the past four hundred years. In the treatise on Judges (Sepher Shophetim: i.e., the last part of his Code, Iad haHazakah) he had stated that the Messiah would die, and not, as the Rabbi had suggested earlier, live eternally: and Pablo asked for a copy of the work in ques-

[28] I do not think with the latest editor (A. Shochet: 1947) that this passage is purely fanciful. It seems to link up with the point just mentioned, and follows another completely authentic allusion to the Disputation of Barcelona, which is however stated to have taken place in the presence of King Pedro (not Jaime). Perhaps these details may be derived from an independent account, now lost.

tion to be brought to him. Nahmanides replied that Maimonides said nothing of the sort. Some Rabbis, as he had explained, did in fact think that the Messiah would be immortal; others, on the other hand (and this was his own view) held that he would redeem his people, live to a ripe age, die as other men died and be succeeded by his son, there being no difference between this world and the Messianic days except that then Israel would be free. By this time, the book had been brought, and Fray Pablo searched unsuccessfully for the passage he had adduced, without success. The Rabbi, better versed in such literature, took it from his hand and translated the concluding passages of the last section of the Sepher Shophetim, entitled 'Laws of the Kings' (Hikhoth Melakhim) which expounds the Jewish doctrine of the tokens and functions of the Messiah in a frankly anti-Christian sense. Fray Arnaldo de Segurra, although he had previously shown himself so benevolent, could not contain himself.

'The book lies in its throat!' he cried.

'Just now, you were saying that Maimonides was the greatest Jewish sage; now, you call him a liar,' Nahmanides retorted; and the King intervened to say that it was improper to speak disrespectfully of a scholar. The Rabbi followed up his advantage by bringing chapter and verse, especially from chapter xxx of Deuteronomy, to support Maimonides' views. The discussion was now brought to an end, after a brief session, the Christian protagonists seething with rage at what had been said towards the close.

It by now appeared to many of those present that the proceedings had lasted too long, and that the Rabbi had been too outspoken. Some friendly-disposed clerics sent messages warning him not to arouse the implacable Dominicans by speaking against Christianity any further; various knights and members of the royal household similarly told him that it was unwise to argue in this fashion in the Friars' presence; the Franciscan scholar, Fray Pere of Genoa, said that the discussions were developing a dangerous tendency, and that it was desirable to suspend them: leading Jews too were advised to restrain their Rabbi's outspokenness. The latter arrived at the royal palace next day (Friday, July 27th?) to find that benches had been arranged to accommodate the audience, which was larger than on any previous occasion

and included, besides as before the Bishop of Barcelona, some distinguished members of the royal household (among whom he mentions Juan de Serbitan (?), Guillén de Cervello and Pere de Berga) and numerous knights: moreover, many townspeople even of the lower classes had learned what was happening and crowded into the hall. The atmosphere was distinctly menacing: and before the proceedings opened the Rabbi told the King (who was as usual occupying his throne against the wall) that he had been advised by certain persons whom he mentioned not to continue the discussions, adding that the Dominicans were intimidating everyone. This was a tactical error, for Fray Pere had no alternative other than to repudiate the statement that had been made in his name; the Latin protocol was thus able to record that the Rabbi, utterly discomfited in argument, had recourse to prevarication in order to end the encounter and so save his credit.

The general feeling was that the discussions should continue. The Rabbi then suggested that, since he had been compelled to stand on the defensive for three days, he should now be permitted to ask his adversary some questions; but the King did not approve of this. Fray Pablo passed therefore to the second point on the agreed agenda, whether or no according to prophecy the Messiah was Man, or both Man and God. Nahmanides protested: the first point, that the Messiah had already come, had not yet been proved, he said; if the other denied this, he was prepared to bring forward yet further arguments to sustain his case. The judges present were inclined to agree with him; but once again the King intervened, saying that even if he was correct he should reply to the points that had been raised. Reluctantly he complied. He maintained that there was nothing in the Bible to suggest that the Messiah was to be other than a man, born like other men were born, and of Davidic (not Divine) descent: to support this, he adduced the somewhat fanciful theory that the 'Shiloh' of the Blessing of Jacob refers to the *shiliah* or after-birth (Deuteronomy xxviii.57), this emphasizing the Messiah's purely human nature.

The Friar now expounded the Christological interpretation of Psalm cx.1 ('The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand') which the King considered an exceptionally strong point in favor of the Christian argument. ('If I had a descendant I

would not call him "My Lord," but I would expect him to call me so, and to kiss my hand,' he observed.) The Rabbi retorted that this argument was old and trite, and professed himself to be amazed that Fray Pablo should have been so impressed by it as to become converted: was it really necessary to have arranged a public controversy to discuss such a triviality? This psalm, he said, was written by King David, to be sung by the Levites in the Temple: it would have been out of the question for them to have chanted 'The Lord said unto Me.' The phrase simply meant that God would protect the King, alluding both to David himself and to the Messiah his descendant: the 'right hand' of God was the accepted symbol of victory. The Friar, however, pointed out that the Jewish sages did in fact apply this verse to the Messiah, and explicitly said [29] that he would sit at the right hand of God. This Nahmanides could not deny, but he read the entire context from the codex which was apparently available in the Palace, where it was stated that at that time Abraham would sit on God's left hand and would be jealous of his descendant. Obviously, then, he said, the two were on a similar level: was it likely, indeed, that the Patriarch would be jealous of God? Moreover, this Haggadic passage, written long (five hundred years, he thought) after the time of Jesus, referred to the distant future; the Friar had taken it completely out of its context.

The next passage brought up for discussion was a simile in a Rabbinic gloss (Ialkut, § 672) to Leviticus xxvi.12, where God is compared to a King walking among the workmen in his garden ('paradise'), assuring them that he was a man like themselves. Fray Pablo took this literally, with obvious conclusions, but Nahmanides refused to do so: even if one did, he added, the stage would be the Garden of Eden, where Jesus never walked as a man.[30]

Fray Pablo now turned to the Midrash to Genesis i.2, which states that the spirit of God that moved on the face of the waters at the time of the Creation was the spirit of the Messiah, who was therefore equated with God. But it also says that this phrase refers to the spirit of Adam, retorted Nahmanides: was he God

[29] Cf. Midrash to Psalms, xviii.36.

[30] This passage is omitted in the older editions of the Hebrew text.

too? The Rabbis interpreted this passage allegorically: just as the Spirit of God introduced order into Tohu-bohu, so the Messiah was to settle the anarchy of the world when he came to redeem Israel from its bondage to the Fourth Monarchy, that of Rome. Indeed, the phrase 'the spirit of God' was used too in connection with Bezalel (Exodus xxxi.3) and Joshua (Deuteronomy xxxiv.9). The Rabbi records that he deliberately piled on his sarcasm at this point, in the hope of discrediting his adversary who, he held, knew very little of the Talmud other than some Midrashic material. He adds that he refrained from expounding the full meaning of this passage and its recondite, or even esoteric, implications.

Whether because no more time was left, or because the atmosphere was becoming too tense, or to give Fray Pablo a breathing-space, the King now arose from his seat, and the session was suspended. Later on in the same day, however, Nahmanides returned to the palace, obtained an audience of the King, and asked him once again to stop the Disputation. The latter was in a good humor, for he had clearly enjoyed himself: 'I have never known a man who was in the wrong argue his case as well as you have done,' he said, if the Rabbi is to be believed. He agreed therefore that the Disputation should now end: but only, according to the Latin protocol, if the other would undertake to continue the discussions before a restricted audience consisting of a few persons only. The first question on the agreed agenda had been discussed at some length: the second had been broached, but little more; the third, whether the ceremonial practices of Judaism should still be observed, had been touched upon only incidentally.[31]

The Dominicans considered their champion triumphant over

[31] According to the accepted accounts, the discussions now ended. But there is extant a Hebrew composition of Nahmanides (published Prague 1595; Warsaw 1837; Leipzig 1853) demonstrating the choice of Israel and the immutability of the Torah — virtually, that is, the item of the agenda that was omitted in the public disputation — delivered before the King and his court in Saragossa. There is in the Hebrew account of the Disputation no reference to this episode, which must therefore almost certainly have taken place later. Unfortunately, the work contains no indication whatsoever of the date or other circumstances. But it seems reasonable to deduce that, some time between 1263 and 1267 (more probably between August 1263 and April 1265: see below) Nahmanides was at court again, and was invited to give an exposition of his views on the aspect that had not been dealt with in the Disputation. This might perhaps explain the renewal of the Dominican acerbity against him.

his adversary: 'Omnia, que confessus est et que ei probata sunt vel fere omnia prius negavit, et postea redargutus per auctoritates confusus coactus est confiteri,' as the Latin protocol puts it. But they were not content with what they considered a verbal triumph against one man: they wished this to be used as an instrument against his coreligionists. Their forte was preaching, and they had already preached among the Jews, or at least among those Jews whom they could induce to hear them. It was now necessary to ensure an audience, to whom they could tell of their Rabbi's 'discomfiture.' In order to give this new scheme a resplendent beginning, the King himself proposed to accompany the Dominican preachers to the Synagogue on the Saturday of the following week, when it was intended that the new conversionist campaign was to commence. While he was in the royal palace that afternoon, Nahmanides heard of this, and courageously determined to be present. He accordingly remained behind in Barcelona for another eight days, instead of going home.

On Saturday, 4th August, accordingly, he was in Synagogue to greet the King and his train, among whom there was not only the apostate Pablo Cristiá but also Fray Ramón de Penyafort himself. There now took place an episode unexampled in all history, which curiously illustrates the medieval mentality: the King himself arose before the assembled Jewish congregation and gave an allocution to prove that Jesus was Messiah. Nahmanides, though not perhaps prepared for this, was ready with a courteous and witty reply, which absolved him from arguing the point. Their ancestors, he said, had not been convinced by Jesus himself, who was in a position to substantiate his claims; His Majesty should not take it amiss if they were not convinced by him.

Fray Ramón de Penyafort now took charge, and gave a sermon on the nature of the Trinity, in which matter, he said, Fray Pablo had compelled the Rabbi to agree with him when they had their encounter at Gerona. Nahmanides, indignant, denied this statement categorically, and gave his account of the discussions on the subject that they had had both then and a few days before, during the Disputation in the royal palace, in which as he felt he had emerged triumphant; [32] at least, he had the satisfaction of

[32] See above for a résumé of this.

being able to convince his coreligionists that he had not been silenced, as the Friars maintained.

Fray Pablo himself now took up the argument, pointing out that the doctrine of the Trinity did not impinge upon the perfect unity of the Godhead, but was so profound that even the angels were unable to appreciate it fully. 'In that case, even the Angels do not believe in the Trinity, for no one believes what he cannot comprehend,' retorted the Rabbi (a curious statement even at such a juncture for an anti-rationalist). It was not a very profound remark, but Fray Pablo did not reply (Nahmanides had the impression that he was prevented by his companions). The King then arose and left the building.

On the following day, he gave Nahmanides a further audience and permitted him to return home, presenting him with 300 sueldos to defray the expenses that he had incurred during his absence; and they parted on cordial terms. The Hebrew account is confirmed at this point by a later document in the Archives of the Crown of Aragon which records how the King had borrowed the sum in question for this purpose from a certain Jewish capitalist.[33] Notwithstanding this, the Latin protocol alleges that he fled from Barcelona secretly, during the King's absence, against his pledged word to continue the discussions under different conditions. That, certainly, is not the timorous sort of action of which he would have been guilty: the one thing that is abundantly clear from the record of the Disputation is that, even though he may have been lacking somewhat in tact, he had the courage of a lion. There may, however, have been an honest misunderstanding on this point, the Dominicans believing that the Disputation would be formally continued forthwith in more intimate circumstances, while Nahmanides considered that it was enough for him to expound his views before the King, at some convenient time in the future, on the aspects of the question that had not been formally broached at the Disputation. (This, in fact, he seems to

[33] J. Régné, Catalogue des Actes de Jaime Ier . . . concernant les Juifs, § 319: the other official documents that will be cited below are in the same collection, first published in the Revue des Etudes Juives, 1910–11. Some of them are printed in full in F. de Bofarull y Sans, Jaime I y los Judíos, in Congrés d'història de la Corona d'Aragó dedicat a l'alt rei En Jaume I i la seva època (also published separately, Barcelona, 1911).

have done some little time afterwards at Saragossa, when he gave his discourse at Court on the immutability of the Torah.[34]) Meanwhile, he returned to Gerona — apparently during the King's absence at Villafranca where he went for a brief visit (August 9th–12th) on the Thursday after his memorable appearance in Synagogue.

The Dominicans claimed a complete victory in the encounters, and determined to press their advantage to the full. They drew up an account of the Disputation as they conceived it to have taken place, telling of the discomfiture and secret flight of the Rabbi of Gerona; and they persuaded the King to sign it, probably unexamined.[35] On August 26th, they succeeded in procuring from him an order for Jews and Saracens to listen quietly to the addresses of the Preaching Friars who were to come to convert them, thus putting these conversionist sermons on a legal basis — not for the first time. (The principle was to be given Papal sanction by the Bull vineam sore only sixteen years later.) Immediately after, the censorship of Hebrew books already familiar in France for the past twenty years was introduced. We have seen how the concluding section of Maimonides' Code (חיבוז שופטים) had been cited during the Disputation and caused much indignation because of its vigorous exposition of the Jewish messianic doctrine; and in consequence, the King was prevailed upon to issue an order to the Jews to give up for public burning the work entitled Sofftim [36] written by 'a certain Jew named Mosse the son of Maymo, an Egyptian of Cairo.' In addition, the Jews were enjoined to delete from their books within a space of three months all 'blasphemies' against Jesus Christ and the Virgin Mary (this was more or less in conformity with the Papal bulls of 1239–1247, not hitherto complied with in Spain). Thirty Jews were to be sworn in every aljama to see to the execution of this. Fray Pablo Cristiá was put in charge of the onslaught against his former coreligionists, who were enjoined to receive him in their synagogues and homes, to listen humbly and respectfully to his harangues, and to bring

[34] See above, note 31.

[35] The date is not given, but it figures in the Archives of the Crown of Aragon between documents of August 28th and August 30th.

[36] The printed text has *Soffrim*, which is obviously a misreading. It seems that separate codices of this treatise were believed to — and perhaps did — exist.

their books to him; [37] with him were associated in the work of censorship his two fellow-Dominicans, Ramón de Penyafort and Arnaldo de Segarra. Later on, however, a supervisory commission was appointed, which included (besides these two and Ramón Martí) also the Franciscan Fray Pere of Genoa and Berenguer de Anglesola, Bishop of Barcelona, who were presumably a restraining influence.[38]

Meanwhile, as we have seen, Nahmanides had returned to his native Gerona. The Bishop of that city, Pedro de Castellnou, appears to have been a person of tolerant and enquiring mind: and as it seems he asked the Rabbi to set down for his benefit the substance of the controversy in which he had participated. This the latter did, in Latin or Catalan — no doubt, along the same lines as the Hebrew account from his pen, so greatly used in the foregoing pages, which he drew up for the benefit of his coreligionists. The facts reached the ears of the Dominicans, who were furious. Regardless of the circumstances and the auspices, and of the promise of complete immunity which the Rabbi had elicited at the outset from Ramón de Penyafort, as well as from the King, they requested the latter to take appropriate steps. He, perhaps persuaded that his promise covered the spoken word only and not the written, decided to banish the Rabbi from the realm for a period of two years and to burn his pamphlet.

This sentence seemed far too mild to the Dominicans, who were apparently out for blood, and they refused to accept it. Penyafort, Segurra, and Cristiá hence again accused Nahmanides before the King for what he had said and done, and demanded exemplary punishment. In April 1265, the Rabbi was summoned before the royal court to exculpate himself. An enquiry was held by a commission consisting of the Bishop of Barcelona, various jurists, and some secular clergy (the Friars were apparently excluded) in whose presence he made a declaration recounting the circum-

[37] Régné, op. cit., nos. 212, 215, 216 (28th–29th August 1263). It seems as though the new regulations were applied at the outset with unnecessary ferocity, as on August 30th the King issued another edict enjoining moderation in the treatment of the Jews and forbidding violence to be brought to bear by the Preachers: ibid., no. 217.

[38] Ibid., no. 249 (27th March 1264). A little less than a year later, probably as the result of a heavy payment by the Jews, the Censorship was abolished, at least for Barcelona: ibid., no. 318.

stances of the Disputation, the immunity promised him and of the composition of his pamphlet. This was deemed satisfactory. King Jaime therefore, far from passing a more severe sentence, apparently suspended the former one. At the same time, he ordered that Nahmanides was only to answer in his own presence for anything he had said or done, thus making impossible summary action on the part of the Friars. The Rabbi returned home under the protection of a royal safe conduct, threatening any person who should molest him with a penalty of 500 morabiti.[39]

Discomfited before the King, the Dominicans now had recourse to the Pope, Clement IV, before whom they laid their complaint, Pablo Cristiá apparently going to Rome for the purpose as their representative. In consequence, His Holiness addressed a Bull to King Jaime remonstrating with him. He was instructed to confer no public office on the Jews, to check their blasphemies against the Christian religion, and above all to punish the Jew, Astrugus de Porta, who had written and distributed in various regions, so as to diffuse its errors, a book filled with lies and prevarications ('multis confictis adiectisque mendaciis') about the controversy that he had held with Paul the Christian in the royal presence.[40] (It seems as though Nahmanides had now elaborated his account in Hebrew and sent it to those places where Fray Pablo was conducting his propaganda.) However, the Pope went on, the culprit was not to be put in danger of his life nor to be mutilated — perhaps what the other side had asked.

The date of this communication is not indicated, but it can be confined between narrow limits by the fact that Clement was

[39] See the full text in F. de Bofarull y Sans, Jaime I y los Judíos, pp. 67–8: synopsis in Régné, op. cit., no. 323.

The sequence of events at this time is confused by the fact that almost simultaneously the King had to deal with the case of a Jew of Villafranca de Panades named Astrug de Porta (Nahmanides is called in the records of Bonastruc de Porta!) brother of the royal bailiff, Benveniste de Porta, who was similarly charged with having blasphemed Christianity in the course of discussions (*disputando* does not I take it signify 'in the course of a disputation' as has sometimes been inferred). On May 29th, 1264, the sentence of exile which had been passed on him for this offence was annulled, in return for an outright money-payment: and this was confirmed in the following February, when he also was given a safe conduct. (Régné, op. cit., nos. 262, 315, 316; Bofarull y Sans, op. cit., pp. 60, 65, where the full texts are given. For this episode, cf. J. Millás Vallicrosa, Un error en la biografia de Mosse ben Nahman de Gerona in Estudis Universitaris Catalans, x. 194 ff.)

[40] Potthast, Regesta Pontificum Romanorum § 19911.

elected Pope in February 1265 and died in November 1268: probably the document belongs to 1266 or the next year. It was accompanied or followed by two Bulls issued in July 1267 — the one, Turbato corde, directed against renegades, and making it possible for the Inquisitional procedure to be used in this connection even against Jews; and the other renewing that of Gregory IX against the Talmud and ordering its confiscation in the kingdom of Aragon. This, together with a covering letter to the Archbishop of Taragona instructing him to see that it was carried into effect, was brought back to Spain by Pablo Cristiá, whose coöption in the new onslaught was cordially recommended.[41]

No record survives which shows the reaction at the court of Aragon to the Pope's demand for proceedings against Nahmanides. One may, however, assume that the King, unable to remain inactive, went back to his previous plan of exiling the Rabbi for a short period, or perhaps counselled him to leave the country. In any case, the next information that we have about him is from Palestine — then as always the natural land of refuge for the homeless Jew. On Thursday, 2nd September, 1267, after a brief stay at Acre, he arrived at last in Jerusalem, whence he sent a famous letter to his son in Spain (where he was in the royal service) describing the utterly desolate state of the Holy City and of Palestine as a whole, where 'the greater a place's sanctity the greater its desolation.' In the few years of life left him he did all that was possible to reorganize the life of the slender remnant of Palestinian Jewry, and established a house of study whither pupils came to him from neighboring lands. He died, probably in Acre, in or about the year 1270. His literary output, down to his

[41] Fray Pablo ultimately recrossed the Pyrenees to continue his propaganda. In 1269, St. Louis, King of France, issued instructions that the Jews should be compelled to listen to his sermons. In 1269–70, he was responsible for the renewal of the edict imposing the wearing of the Jewish Badge of Shame in France, and for an outbreak of Inquisitional activity against the Jews of Provence. Here he forced a religious discussion upon R. Mordecai ben Jehosaphah, who composed in consequence a work, Mehazek heEmunah ('Strengthening of Faith'), which apparently resulted in his imprisonment. Fray Pablo subsequently continued his propaganda (it may be that he was that convert, designated, however, as a Cordelier, who forced a disputation on Abraham ben Solomon of Dreux and other Rabbis, under the auspices of Philip le Hardi, at Paris in 1273), and died in 1274 in Taormina (Sicily) or Tormon (Spain): cf. Shevet Jehudah, ed. Shochet, p. 148; (Neubauer-) Renan, Les Rabbins français, pp. 563–5; Jewish Quarterly Review, iii. 216; Gross, Gallia Judaica, pp. 4–5.

last days, had been considerable. Perhaps the pamphlet containing his account of the Disputation with Pablo Cristiá is today the best known of his writings. Medieval polemical literature as a whole makes dreary reading; but this is at the same time a human document, enlivened by occasional flashes of humor, by demonstrations of a courage beyond the ordinary, and by glimpses of an attractive personality. From the human and literary point of view, certainly, the Hebrew document is far superior to its Latin counterpart.

On the other hand, it is impossible to think of the outcome of the controversy in terms of success or failure. The two adversaries were setting out from entirely different premises, and in the shadow-battle which resulted both tilted as it were at phantoms, without really getting to blows. For discussions on the application of Biblical verses and the significance of Talmudic legends affected the validity of neither faith.

NEO-ORTHODOXY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH

JOHN H. OTWELL

Pacific School of Religion
Berkeley, California

Writing in 1937, D. W. Riddle was able to assert that dialectical theology had exerted little or no influence on biblical studies in America in spite of its importance in Europe.[1] This statement would not be as true today as it was then. Yet it remains sufficiently valid to underline an interesting situation. While Neo-orthodoxy has become increasingly prominent in many areas of American thought, it has made very little progress among biblical critics.[2] Is this an indication of an intellectual vested interest automatically resistant to change, or is it, instead, the reflection of the impact of certain phases of Neo-orthodoxy upon historical study as such? It is the purpose of this paper to attempt to analyze this problem.

No claims to exhaustiveness are made for this presentation. It is a statement of the problem chiefly in terms of the writings of Karl Barth and Rudolf Bultmann.[3] The conclusions stated are applicable, this writer believes, to all neo-orthodox thinkers in direct proportion to their adherence to the extreme statement of the problem as it is given here.

One of the most striking features of the thought of Barth and Bultmann might be called religious historical relativism. This is the assertion that unsaved man cannot discern God's activity in history. The religious historical relativism itself, however, is merely a restricted statement of the more fundamental declaration

[1] Riddle, D. W., "German Influence on American New Testament Studies," Christendom, II (1937), pp. 242–253; p. 253.

I wish to express my thanks to Karl Barth and to Hodder & Stoughton, the Lutterworth Press, and the Oxford University Press for their kind permission to use certain quotations.

[2] The terms "dialectical theology" and "Neo-orthodoxy" are taken to be synonymous throughout this discussion.

[3] A larger study included an intensive examination of Emil Brunner, Reinhold Niebuhr, and C. H. Dodd, as well as the two named above.

that man, of his own efforts, can know nothing of God. It is here, therefore, that the inquiry must be begun.

II

Man's inability to find God, according to Barth, is the result of the impassable gulf that exists between the transcendent, completely holy God and sinful man. His strong emphasis on God as the "Wholly Other" [4] is matched by his insistence that man as such is sinful.

> If there were a special Reformed doctrine of *man* . . . it could in point of fact only consist in the doctrine of *sin*. For man in his separation from God and in his distinctive character over against God is sinful man, i.e., man who is missing his way and violating the ordinance of his existence.[5]

As a result of the dualism introduced by the emphasis on God's transcendence and man's sinfulness, Barth asserts the futility of human efforts to attain to a knowledge of God. The gulf between the two is impassable from that side responsible for it — i.e., man as sinner. What man claims to be a knowledge of God is nothing more than the reflection of his own sinfulness.[6]

Since man cannot act to find God, God Himself must take the initiative. That He has done so is, for Barth, the core of the Christian gospel. He wrote, "Revelation in the Bible means the self-disclosure to man of the God undisclosable in His nature to man." [7] But the act of revelation is an individual, Jesus Christ,

[4] Barth, K., The Word of God and the Word of Man (The Pilgrim Press), 1928; trs. by Douglas Horton; pp. 45, 74. Barth does not use this term frequently, but it is a fair characterization of his attitude.

[5] Barth, K., The Knowledge of God and the Service of God According to the Teachings of the Reformation (London, Hodder & Stoughton), 1938; trs. by J. L. M. Haire and Ian Henderson; p. 46. Although this is Barth's statement of the Reformation doctrine of man, it is also a description of his own doctrine of unredeemed man. His position is described in his Die Kirchliche Dogmatik: Die Lehre von der Schöpfung (Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, E. G. Zollikon), 1948, 3, pt. 2.

[6] Barth, K., and Thurneysen, E., Come Holy Spirit (New York, Round Table Press), 1934; trs. by G. W. Richards, E. G. Homrighausen, and K. J. Ernst; pp. 9, 42. Cf. also, by the same authors, God's Search for Man (New York, Round Table Press), 1935; trs. by G. W. Richards, E. G. Homrighausen, K. J. Ernst; pp. 95 ff. Cf. also Barth, Knowledge of God and the Service of God, pp. 33, 50.

[7] Barth, K., Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes, Prolegomena zur Kirchlichen Dogmatik (Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, E. G. Zollikon), I, pt. 1, vierte auflage, 1944; pp.

who embodies within himself both humanity, in order to speak to men, and divinity, in order to be able to speak for God.

> The 'Incarnation of the Word' means: the presence of God in our world and as a member of this world, as man among men and therein and thereby God's revelation to us, our reconciliation with him.[8]

Thus, according to Barth, God has entered history in order to confront man. But this does not mean that the historian can find Him there. It must be remembered that human knowledge can never see Him. This applies to the work of the historian as much as to that of the philosopher. The position Barth took in writing the preface to the first edition of his work on Romans still holds:

> The historical-critical method of Biblical investigation has its rightful place: it is concerned with the preparation of the intelligence — and this can never be superfluous. But, were I driven to choose between it and the venerable doctrine of inspiration, I should without hesitation adopt the latter, which has a broader, deeper, more important justification.[9]

In the actual practice of this Barth has so thoroughly rejected the historical approach that it serves no other purpose than that of gathering such illustrative tidbits as the preacher may wish to use.

In place of the historical examination of the Bible Barth suggests quite a different approach. Insisting that the revelation contained in scripture is an expression of the free activity of God which is subject to no human interpretation,[10] he declares:

> Who expounds Scriptures? . . . in fact, if Scripture as testimony to Jesus Christ is the Word of God . . . who then can expound Scripture but God Himself? . . . *Scriptura scripturae interpres* — Scripture is the interpreter of Scripture.[11]

In actual practice, however, the operation of the Holy Spirit within the believer who seeks a knowledge of the meaning of the

322 f. Hereafter cited as Dogmatik I:1. All quotations from German works are given in this writer's translation.

[8] Barth, K., Die Lehre vom Wort Gottes, Prolegomena zur Kirchlichen Dogmatik, I, pt. 2 (Zürich, Evangelischer Verlag, A. G. Zollikon), 1938; p. 188. Hereafter cited as Dogmatik I:2. Cf. also Dogmatik I:1, pp. 426 ff. for a similar defense of the divinity of Christ.

[9] Barth, K., The Epistle to the Romans (Oxford, University Press), 1933; trs. from the 6th German edition by E. C. Hoskyns; p. 1.

[10] Barth, Dogmatik I:1, p. 321; Dogmatik I:2, p. 66.

[11] Barth, Knowledge of God and the Service of God, p. 182.

Bible is assisted by two other principles. The first is the unity of the scriptures. This principle, for Barth, is found in the nature and work of Jesus Christ as they have already been outlined here. The New Testament, he comments, ". . . pronounces on all its pages ever anew the *name* Jesus Christ." [12] Even when the text of a New Testament book does not support this, Barth insists upon the validity of reading it in. He admits as much when he remarks, concerning his exposition of the person and work of Christ,

> The dogma as such does not stand in the Biblical text. The dogma is an interpretation. But we can convince ourselves that it is a good, relevant interpretation of this text. Thus we throw our lot in with it: the divinity of Christ is true, eternal divinity.[13]

The final principle of interpretation is stated with equal clarity. It is the tradition of the Church. He points out that the Bible is canonical because the Church has accepted it as such,[14] placing upon it that interpretation which has been given it by the Holy Spirit.[15] Thus he can say,

> No reflection can place this presupposition in question. All reflection can only begin with it and return to it . . . Thus, says the dogma, the apostles understood him, and thus we must also understand him if we would understand the apostles.[16]

When the exegete turns to the Bible, therefore, he discovers its message through the prompting of the Holy Spirit. Meaning gained in this way not only testifies to a unity of theme throughout the various books, but is also in harmony with Christian tradition. The end product, of course, is a repudiation of the centrality of the work of the historian. As an individual man of faith, he may hear the promptings of God as clearly as anyone else. But as an historian, practicing the techniques of his profession, he can find nothing but the empty, meaningless shell of the historical Jesus.

[12] Barth, Dogmatik I:2, p. 11.

[13] Barth, Dogmatik I:1, pp. 436 f.

[14] Barth, K., God in Action, Theological Addresses (New York, Round Table Press), 1936; trs. by E. G. Homrighausen and K. J. Ernst; p. 3.

[15] Barth, K., Credo, a Presentation of the Chief Problems of Dogmatics with Reference to the Apostles' Creed (London, Hodder & Stoughton), 1936; trs. by J. S. McNab, pp. 180 ff.

[16] Barth, Dogmatik I:1, p. 436.

The act of God in Christ is inaccessible. Such work is of little more than antiquarian, illustrative value.

Before turning to a consideration of the fruition of this theology in the writings of a New Testament scholar, a few words about less radical exponents of Neo-orthodoxy are in order. The general rule is this: insofar as the individual thinker permits some knowledge of God in unredeemed man, just so far does he increase the value of the work of the historian.

Emil Brunner is an excellent example. In his description of the gulf between God and creation, he does not, as does Barth, believe that the physical universe itself is fallen. The barrier lies only between man and God.[17] Thus Brunner has a place for natural revelation. Man can discover something about God of his own effort by studying His handiwork in nature, even though such knowledge is not adequate for his salvation.[18] Thus it should cause no surprise to find that he also holds the work of the historian in higher repute than does Barth. Brunner suggests that every historical religion must employ historical techniques to demonstrate the truth or falsity of those events upon which it claims to rest.[19] At the same time, however, he shares enough of that outlook seen best in Barth to add that the history which makes faith impossible is false history! [20]

The chief point of difference between Barth and Brunner, as they see it themselves, is the possibility of natural revelation — i.e., a human knowledge of God. Historical investigation is a phase of natural revelation. Thus the precise evaluation placed upon the work of the biblical critic by the neo-orthodox thinker is regulated by his views on this issue.

III

The choice of Rudolf Bultmann as the example of a biblical scholar influenced by Neo-orthodoxy was dictated by necessity.

[17] Brunner, E., The Word and the World (New York, Scribner's), 1931; no translator given; pp. 7 ff.

[18] Brunner, E., Revelation and Reason, the Christian Doctrine of Faith and Knowledge (Philadelphia, Westminster Press), 1946; trs. by Olive Wyon; pp. 60 ff.

[19] Brunner, E., The Mediator (London, Lutterworth Press), 1934; trs. by Olive Wyon; p. 165, note 1; and p. 227. Cf. also by the same author, The Divine Human Encounter (Philadelphia, Westminster Press), 1943; trs. by A. W. Loos; p. 114.

[20] Brunner, Mediator, p. 168.

There are others, but their writings do not give a sufficiently broad coverage of the problem.

At the same time, Bultmann was known to be quite radical in his criticism of the sources of the Synoptic Gospels before his public adherence to the dialectical theology. This is both a disadvantage and an advantage. It is a disadvantage because his critical work is not the obvious result of his theological position.[21] Yet even this will serve our ends since it will underline a facet of Neo-orthodoxy already noted in Barth — the use of "pneumatik" exegesis.[22] Bultmann is a radical critic, so radical that Barth has expressed surprise at his interest in Neo-orthodoxy,[23] but as far as the structure of his interpretative thought is concerned he has merely added to his historical relativism religious historical relativism. Since we are concerned with the second of these two types of historical relativism, we can treat Bultmann without too much reference to the former.[24]

The theological structure of Bultmann's thought exhibits the same basic construction as that already seen in Barth. He regards man as inherently sinful, sinful because he worships himself rather than God, thus making the quest for God impossible.[25] God, on the other hand, is so righteous that He becomes the "Wholly Other." [26] It is possible for man to understand the physical world and to manipulate it, but that knowledge gives no access to God. Indeed, it is merely another aspect of man's self-worship,

[21] It may be argued, however, that many of the factors that led him into his radical position as a New Testament critic also led him into his Neo-orthodox position.

[22] Bultmann uses this older term to designate what he means by exegesis through faith, i.e., exegesis through the prompting of the Holy Spirit.

[23] Barth, Epistle to the Romans, p. 16. This remark comes from 1921 or 1922.

[24] His work as an historian is reflected chiefly in the following: Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (Göttingen, Vandenhoek and Ruprecht), 1921; Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen (Zürich, Artemis-Verlag), 1949; and, Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr), v. 1, 1948; v. 2, 1949. None of these reflect, to any extent, the religious historical relativism which is under examination (but cf. Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen, p. 8).

[25] Bultmann, R., Der Begriff der Offenbarung im Neuen Testament (Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr), 1929; p. 32 f.

[26] Bultmann, R., Glauben und Verstehen (Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr), 1933, pp. 28–30.

his sin.[27] Thus Bultmann shares with Barth the conviction that the physical universe, as well as man, is fallen.

As a result of his adherence to the sinfulness of man and the transcendence of God, Bultmann emerges with the same conclusion voiced by Barth — human knowledge of God is impossible. In all of man's self-attained knowledge he is the creator, the workman. But he also deifies himself in such knowledge, and thus sins.

The conquest of that sin is, for Bultmann as for Barth, the divine act. But it is in his description of the divine act that he differs with Barth. For Bultmann, it is an encounter with God which quickens within the seeker dormant knowledge of his own true nature. He writes:

> Relevation is an *event* which places me in a new position with respect to myself in which, to be sure, the possibility of a new knowledge (i.e., about myself in my new situation) is also established, but without respect to whether this new knowledge becomes explicit.[28]

Thus the divine act is what Bultmann calls "address," an encounter between God and man of such a nature as to awaken within man self-knowledge.[29]

The rôle of Jesus Christ is to act as the catalyst which causes the self-awakening. His divinity is not metaphysical but functional. He came bearing God's word, and those who hear that word are forced into the relationship called revelation.[30] It is for this reason that the later proclamation of the Church about Christ is a part of revelation itself for Bultmann. For Jesus Christ to fulfill his rôle, his message must be presented to men in such a way as to convict them of their sinfulness, thus launching them into the experience of revelation. This function the Church, through its proclamation of the word borne by Jesus, performs.[31]

To achieve this interpretation of the historical records Bultmann had to begin from a far more sceptical position than did

[27] Bultmann, Glauben und Verstehen, pp. 215, 222.

[28] Bultmann, Begriff der Offenbarung, p. 6.

[29] Ibid., p. 11. Cf. also by the same author, Jesus (Berlin, Deutsche Bibliothek), 1929, p. 8. This work is available in English (translated from the 2nd German edition) under the title, Jesus and the Word (New York, Scribner's), 1934.

[30] Bultmann, Glauben und Verstehen, pp. 226 f. Cf. also Jesus, pp. 195 ff.

[31] Bultmann, Begriff der Offenbarung, pp. 27, 29, 44. Cf. also Glauben und Verstehen, pp. 289–292.

Barth. His work, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition,[32] an examination of the Gospels from the viewpoint of Form Criticism, is so radical that he has been called a resurrected Strauss.[33] Thus the rubrics of interpretation which he has adopted are significant.

Note has already been made of Bultmann's insistence that knowledge gained through human effort shares man's sin. At the same time, Bultmann does employ the methods of Form Criticism. But he restricts their use to the task of stripping off those portions of the Scriptures which reflect first century culture — a human construction.[34]

But when that has been done, two principles come to the fore. The first of these is the surrender of the principle of development. Since the significant factor is self-knowledge won through an encounter with God, it is divorced entirely from cultural growth. Each individual wins it for himself in his own life situation.[35] The second of these is the inner witness of experience. Only he who has loved understands it and can see it in others. So, also, only he who has encountered God in Jesus Christ knows that He is there.[36] Indeed, if purely historical techniques are applied to the New Testament records they will eliminate the reality sought.[37]

The results of the application of these principles are visible in Bultmann's "biography" of Jesus. This is not the place to review the contents of that work. Two of its characteristics, however, are important. The first is the use of passages considered late. Where they aid the main thesis they are used. Where they do not, they are rejected or ignored. Thus Bultmann uses several passages in which Jesus is reported to have quoted the Jewish scrip-

[32] Published by Vandenhoek and Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1921. It is available to the English reader in digest form in the chapter by Bultmann, "A Study of the Synoptic Gospels," in F. C. Grant's Form Criticism, a New Method of New Testament Research (Chicago, Willett, Clark & Co.), 1934; pp. 11–74.

[33] Taylor, V., The Formation of the Gospel Tradition (London, MacMillan), 1933; p. 14.

[34] Bultmann, Glauben und Verstehen, p. 120.

[35] Ibid., pp. 121 ff.

[36] Bultmann calls this "pneumatik" exegesis. It is the same principle as that one described as exegesis by faith in the discussion of Barth. The final guide in determining the historical event is the witness given by God through His spirit — thus only he who has experienced that faith in Christ implanted by the Spirit, can study Christ historically. See his Glauben und Verstehen, pp. 116 f., and Begriff der Offenbarung, p. 24.

[37] Bultmann, Glauben und Verstehen, p. 246.

tures, validating his use of material he considers late by arguing that the Church, influenced by Paul's repudiation of the Law, would not have accepted the tradition that Jesus quoted had that tradition not been true.[38] On the other hand, Bultmann rejects or ignores those proverbial sayings attributed to Jesus because they are irrelevant to his theme.[39] But an equally strong case can be made for the authenticity of the tradition that Jesus spoke in proverbs. Bultmann himself insists that our sources reflect a hostility between Jews and Christians, a hostility arising out of an assumed clash between Judaism and Christianity in the early history of the Church. Why, therefore, would the Christian Church preserve the tradition that Jesus employed Jewish proverbial lore were that not an authentic tradition? Actually, the basis for the use, or lack of use of these two types of materials is nothing other than the thesis being argued — a thesis itself determined through pneumatic exegesis.

The second characteristic to be noted is the manner in which Bultmann sustains his definition of Jesus' rôle from the examination of Jesus' teachings. This is allied closely to the former point. Jesus' rôle, he believes, is to force men into a confrontation with God by preaching a gospel of such emphasis on the closeness of the end that they must decide for or against Him.[40] Thus Jesus' teachings must reflect this demand for decision to the virtual exclusion of all else. In commenting on Luke 22:15–18 (from which he deletes the references to Jesus' suffering in vv. 15, 17), Bultmann maintains that an older tradition is visible through the later additions which presents Jesus as declaring the urgent nearness of the Kingdom.[41] So, also, the content of the concept of the Kingdom of God in Jesus' thought is seen to refer to the demand upon men of the either/or of God.[42] That historical criticism has seen in this belief in the kingdom the upsurge of a demand for justice is irrelevant. That is the product of human, and therefore sinful, thought. This other interpretation of the central meaning of the concept is the fruit of exegesis by faith.

[38] Bultmann, Jesus, p. 60. It should also be pointed out that Paul himself quoted frequently from that same Law!

[39] Bultmann, "Study of the Synoptic Gospels," in Grant, Form Criticism, p. 55.

[40] Bultmann, Jesus, pp. 51 f.

[41] Ibid., p. 30.

[42] Ibid., p. 40.

It should be apparent from this that Bultmann's work is consciously divided into two areas. In the first he works as an historian and determines what is authentic to Jesus. Having completed this task, he then moves on to a description of the meaning of the New Testament (which he equates with the purpose of Jesus) in which he follows the principle of pneumatic exegesis. Here he uses such passages, regardless of authorship, as his thesis requires, and fills others with such content as he needs. The historian has vanished. The speculative thinker has taken his place.

IV

From this discussion, the basic issue which Neo-orthodoxy poses for biblical scholarship should have emerged. It is the continuance or dissolution of the historical examination of the Bible. The neo-orthodox thinker may insist that he warmly welcomes historical research into the Bible as long as it does not exceed its limitations — as he would define them. Unfortunately, those limitations, in effect, are: if your work does not support my position it is false. Under such conditions the historian becomes either silent or a collector of small bits of information which can be used to make a dogmatic presentation appear to have an air of erudition.

Biblical scholars are historians of religion.[43] They are not antiquarians. If it should be demonstrated that their methods cannot discern religion, their *raison d'être* will have ceased. This attempt in that direction, however, is far from convincing. There are at least three reasons why it is unsound.

The first arises out of the confusion created in neo-orthodox thought between the methods of discerning historical fact (which includes both the event itself and the meaning given it at the time of the writing of the records) and the personal appropriation of meaning arising out of an experience of that fact or the record of

[43] By the use of the term "religion" here I do not propose to evade the issue as stated by Barth. He regards religion as a human construction and as sinful in itself as any other such construction. As I define it, however, it is the experience, and the record of that experience, of God's dealings with men. And since I cannot see what other knowledge of God man may have than this, whatever is known to any man about God (even including the extensive writings of Karl Barth!) falls within this definition.

an earlier experience of that event. There are three levels of reality involved. In the case of the New Testament resurrection narratives, for example, there is the original experience within the early Church in response to whatever event there was; this awoke a religious response based on the meaning given the event, a response interpreted and described in terms of the cultural and thought patterns of the day; finally, there is the response of contemporary man to the totality just described, or to any part of it. By its repudiation of historical method and its substitution of exegesis by faith, Neo-orthodoxy requires of us that we accept the second level as a description of the original event — first century world-view and all! [44]

But this places modern man in a very difficult position. He is getting his faith "warmed over." Instead, he should be allowed to see, as far as that is possible, what did happen so that he may respond to it in terms of his own culture — just as the early Church did in its age. There must be a careful distinction between the establishment of historical event and the response to it in faith. Radical Neo-orthodoxy prevents this by using faith to establish the fact of the event.

A second consequence results from the one just discussed. It is the problem of extreme variations in the meaning resulting from historical investigation conducted with pneumatic exegesis. No historian claims that he and all his brethren have reached agreement on all points — or even the majority of them. But one of the basic motivations behind the use of the historical method is the desire to achieve an understanding of the Bible divorced from doctrinal demands and the vagaries of private response. This has been achieved to a greater degree through the use of the historical approach than through any other method. Certainly exegesis by faith is no improvement. Both Barth and Bultmann use it, yet two more dissimilar sets of results could hardly be found.[45]

[44] Even this statement is not quite correct. What we are asked to accept is a garbled version of one phase of Reformation doctrine. I call it garbled because the reaction of the church historian to Barth is much like that of the biblical student. Cf. Pauck, W., Karl Barth, Prophet of a New Christianity? (New York, Harpers), 1931; especially p. 168.

[45] This becomes all the more striking when it is remembered that the basic pattern of thought is the same for both.

In reality, the use of faith exegesis produces variants in results with no means of reconciling them. If two men using it differ, how can their work be reconciled? It has been Brunner, and not Barth, who has faced this problem. And his answer is very significant.

> If a Catholic and a Protestant argue together about the true faith, an impartial third party cannot act as judge in the controversy, but in spite of this a criterion of right and true faith does exist; but it can only be grasped by faith itself.[46]

Finally, the historian whose work has been discredited because it reflects the sinfulness of human knowledge should point out that the activity of God in history must be apparent to *sinful* man in order to become revelation. Were this not so, those who first confronted Jesus would not have believed in him! Zaccheus did not first see Jesus through the eyes of faith. He saw him while still a sinner. Yet, if we are to credit the record, he believed. The problem of the sinfulness of man is acute. But a statement of it which makes impossible the Christian story is an odd "biblical theology!" And that story is one of sinful people seeing God at work and believing. Faith has always come after the event.

Since this is so, the fact that the techniques of the historian are human, and therefore sinful, has nothing to do with his ability, or lack of ability, to do his work. He may be incompetent. But if he is, the fault lies in his inability to do his work as an historian. If Christianity is a religion which declares its foundations to rest upon what God has done in the past and is doing in the present, it is the historian, not the dogmatist, who will declare what was done in the past.

What is needed is not a defense of the work of the historian as over against that of the theologian, or vice versa. The furor raised by Karl Barth and his followers should serve as a warning to both the historian and the theologian that they need one another. Each of these areas requires such specialization that competence in one or the other is a sufficient achievement for one individual. But neither field is complete in itself. The work of the historian lacks both its full meaning and its contemporary

[46] Brunner, Mediator, p. 217, note 1. Cf. also his Revelation and Reason, pp. 206 ff.

value until it has been brought to completion by the theologian. It is he who will relate historical findings to faith. On the other hand, there is no futility more wearisome than the theologian who declares the historicity of the faith when the historian knows that it simply did not happen that way.

Our need today, therefore, is not the shelving of our historians, but a closer alliance between them and the theologians — an alliance in which there is parity and mutual respect.

DIE WIEDERKEHRENDEN TOTE

Recently, in discussing the famous formula θύραζε κῆρες, I expressed some slight disagreement with Professor M. P. Nilsson, who speaks of the "Boshaftigkeit der wiederkehrenden Toten."[1] That illustrious scholar now informs me that by that phrase he sought to get an equivalent in German for the Swedish "gengångare," which is a dangerous and malignant kind of revenant, in fact the very kind which I hold were abusively called κῆρες by the Athenians, and supposed by them to hang about the floors of houses to pick up what scraps they could get. Thus even the small difference which seemed to exist between his views and mine in this matter disappears.

With regard to the last paragraph of the same article, I have an ingenious and very likely right suggestion from Dr. O. Skutsch of the University of Manchester, namely that the joker who substituted Κᾶρες for κῆρες was also the person who expanded the original two-word formula into a trimeter. This perhaps makes it more than ever likely that the saying in that form comes from a comedy.

H. J. Rose

University of St. Andrews

[1] Harvard Theological Review XLI, p. 226.

JOHN 13.1–30

The story of the washing of the disciples' feet and the Last Supper in John 13 presents at first sight a completely chaotic appearance. We have no fewer than three anticipations of the betrayal by Judas Iscariot, (2,11 and 18) before we come to the full story of Jesus' prophecy of it and the final departure of the traitor.

Further the washing of the disciples' feet has two quite distinct meanings. In the dialogue with Simon, (6–11) the meaning is obscure, but it has something to do with a distinction between degrees of cleanness; the exact meaning will be considered later. But in 12ff. it has quite a different point; it is a lesson to the disciples in humility and mutual service, leading on to the third prophecy of the betrayal and the synoptic saying of 20,(= Mt.10.40,Lk.10.16).[1]

The series of sayings at 12ff. are closely parallel to those of Lk. 22.24–30. The prophecy of the betrayal there comes before the dispute as to precedence; but the dispute as to precedence leads to the sayings of 26ff. which are a variation of the theme of John 13.12–16; the saying as to the twelve thrones has been replaced by the quite different saying of John 13.20, but the meaning of both sayings is that the disciples are in some sense equal to Jesus Himself. It is quite probable that the writer of the Fourth Gospel substituted his version because he disliked the eschatological coloring of the saying of Lk. 22.29f.

It would seem that John had before him an account of the Last Supper in which a collection of sayings, similar to that in Luke, was ascribed to Jesus, and that the lesson as to humility and mutual service was already enforced by the story of the example of the footwashing; whether the story was a legend which had already grown up in the Church or preserved a historical record which was unknown to Mark and his sources cannot be said; our view on this point will depend on our view of the probability that there were any reliable traditions which have

[1] This must not be taken to imply that he is actually following either of these Gospels. An investigation of the relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptics would demand a treatment of the Gospel as a whole, which would be impossible within the scope of this article. For present purposes it is irrelevant whether he is using his general knowledge of the Synoptics but quoting from memory, or using one or more of them, or again using a somewhat different version now lost; it is also possible that he has direct access to some of the sources from which the Synoptic Gospels are drawn.

not survived in the Synoptic Gospels, though it seems hard to suppose that this scene would have been left unrecorded.[2]

But he was not satisfied with leaving the lesson as he found it. It is a commonplace of Hellenistic literature that one ought not to undertake a great matter "with unwashed feet" i.e. without careful preparation whether intellectual or moral. Among various instances of this commonplace, one in particular has a special interest in view of its similarity to the Fourth Gospel, namely Lucian Pseudol.4(165), where the deified ἔλεγχος of Menander, the friend of truth and παρρησία must be called on (παρακλήτεος) to witness that Lucian has not undertaken to his opponent "with unwashed feet, according to the proverb."[3] The coincidence of language between Lucian and the Fourth Gospel at this point can hardly be accidental and suggests that both are following the same tradition of popular philosophy. It would seem that the evangelist expanded the original story by inserting verses 7 and 10f., which are in the best style of Johannine theology; he may have added more, but there is no need to suppose that he has done so, since Peter's protest in 8 and the dialogue which follows up to "but also my hands and my head" would lead up to 12 with a slight but not impossible abruptness. The insertion of 7 made the scene a mysterious introduction to the great discourses which are to follow.

This introduction is amplified in 10. The disciples who have already been cleansed by their association with Jesus stand for the faithful members of the Church at Ephesus when they come to the Eucharist; they are clean, but they need to have their feet washed: but there may be some among them who, though baptized, are not really clean.[4]

[2] In favor of the view that we have a primitive tradition is the wealth of unnecessary detail with which the scene is described in 4f. and again at 12, but I doubt if the point can be pressed.

The washing of feet as a mark of servility appears in rabbinical literature, (cf. Str. — B.ad loc) and also in Hierocles ap.Stob.Anth.4.25.53 (Hense 4.644.1), where children are advised to show special marks of consideration to their parents ὥστε καὶ πόδας ὑπόνιψαι καὶ κλίνην στόρεσαι καὶ παραστῆναι διακονουμένους; the association of the washing of feet with διακονεῖσθαι is interesting in view of the possible connection between this passage and the tradition from which Luke drew 22.26f.

[3] For other references cf. my Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity 76 and add Lucian Demonax 4(376). But I wrongly ascribed the similarity of the footwashing in John and the proverb to coincidence; the original meaning of the Johannine footwashing was to provide a lesson in humility and service. The interpretation of it as a preliminary to the supreme revelation is added by the evangelist on the strength of the proverbial phrase.

[4] The omission of εἰ μὴ τοὺς πόδας by ℵ and other authorities and the D. variant τὴν κεφάλην νίψασθαι seem to be due to scribes who rightly saw in λελούμενος an allusion to baptism, but were puzzled by the fact that the Church had no minor ablutions after baptism; they may also have felt that minor ablutions, as typified

The latter class are those who have fallen into sins for which there is no forgiveness, yet continue to attend the Eucharist, their sins not having been discovered. But every Christian falls into sin from time to time, and his sins, though they do not rob him of his baptismal purity, need to be removed by the minor "washing of his feet" the forgiveness to be obtained by confession, prayer and similar means. Here it will be observed we are dealing with the normal outlook of "Johannine" circles. If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves (1 John 1.8ff.), yet he who abides in Christ does not sin, (3.6ff.); there are sins which are not unto death, and we must pray for the brother who falls into them; for those who fall into sins unto death we may not even pray (5.16).[5] The writer of the Gospel uses the scene of the footwashing to make it clear that there is all the difference in the world between the inevitable sins of daily life, which need to be washed away by divine forgiveness but do not undo the cleansing of baptism, and the unforgiveable sins of those who like Judas appear to be clean, but are not.

We have thus a duplication of the lesson to be drawn from the footwashing and a fourth prophecy of the betrayal. The first and last, (13 and 21) were no doubt dictated to him by his main line of tradition, and correspond to Mk.14.10 and 18f. A third came to him in the "Lucan" collection of sayings and he failed to cut it out, perhaps because it contained a valuable proof-text; his introduction of a fresh theme made the fourth necessary. I cannot think that he is himself responsible for the incident of the footwashing in view of the very clumsy way in which the interpretation of the meaning in 7 and 10 is introduced, while the second interpretation is well worked out.

Wilfred L. Knox *

Pembroke College
Cambridge, England

by the footwashing, might be regarded as a dangerous concession to Judaism. Without the words there is no really tolerable sense. Origen makes the passage mean that he who has been cleansed has no absolute need of minor washings; but such washings may be given him by the free gift of God in the form of special graces which are desirable but not necessary.

[5] For the distinction between two kinds of sin in 1 John cf. Dodd in Moffatt's commentary on 5.16. The Epistle does not attempt to reconcile the inconsistency between 3.6 and the other two passages; but one would hardly expect its author to be a systematic theologian.

* Canon Knox read these pages in proof. His death in February, 1950 deprives the world of a scholar who combined brilliant originality with the highest integrity. A.D.N.

A REMINISCENCE OF PAUL ON A COIN AMULET

Mr. Henri Seyrig, Director of the French Archaeological Institute at Beyrouth, a friend to whom my studies of magical amulets owe a steadily increasing debt, has added another to his many contributions by sending me a careful copy of the inscription here discussed (letter of March 11, 1949). It was incised upon a Roman silver denarius (diameter 15 mm.), both sides of which had been smoothed off in order to receive it. Of the obverse design Mr. Seyrig reports that nothing can be seen; of the reverse type there remains the outline of a galley with oars, which moves to the right.[1]

It is likely that the poorer people often made amulets out of small coins. Some years ago Mr. Harold Mattingly published a Mithraic tessera made from a silver denarius of Augustus.[2] In that instance the inscription of the reverse was obliterated, but the type design, Tarpeia half buried under the heap of shields, was allowed to remain and serve, strangely enough, for a representation of the birth of Mithra from the rock. The obverse was completely smoothed off, and now carries a brief inscription, Μίθρας Ὡρομάσδης Φρην, which combines the names of Mithra, the Persian supreme god, and the Egyptian sun god.

The coin described by Mr. Seyrig was bought by him from a dealer who came from Tortosa, the ancient Antarados. If the amulet was made in or near that town, as seems likely, it is not surprising that the inscription should fall within the sphere of Judaeo-Christian religion, and in fact the coin may be called a Christian amulet, although it is evident that the maker or his employer had not shaken off pagan habits of thought.

The letters are of a kind much used on magical gems of Roman times. Several of their forms are assigned by Larfeld to his Period XVII (A.D. 120–210),[3] and there seems to be no need to consider a date later than 300. It would not be easy, however, to place the inscription at any particular point in the preceding century and a half.

[1] On Roman coins of the Empire, galleys propelled by oars were usually shown with the oars at the end of the stroke, the blades sloping towards the stern of the vessel. On earlier coins, as on Greek vases, this convention was not regularly observed.

[2] Numismatic Chronicle, 1932, pp. 54–57.

[3] Larfeld, Handb. der griech. Epigraphik, III, pp. 490–495.

The construction of the text is continued from the obverse to the reverse.

Obverse. *ἐπικαλοῦμε τὸ ἅγιον κὲ μέγιστον ὄνομα ἵνα μοι συνεργῇ πάντα ὅσα θέλω.*

Reverse. *ἵνα μοι ὑποτάσι πᾶσαν ἀνθρωπίνην ἡμέραν.*

Read *ἐπικαλοῦμαι, καί, ὑποτάσσῃ.* The cross stroke of alpha has been omitted in five instances, as is often done in the lettering of magical amulets; and similar negligence has been noted on more pretentious monuments.[4] The bottom of the omega at the end of the obverse inscription is worn away. For the construction of *συνεργῇ* compare Xen. Mem. 3.5.16, *συνεργεῖν αὐτοῖς τὰ συμφέροντα.*

Translate, "I invoke the holy and greatest name that it may help me accomplish all that I wish, that it may give me the upper hand in every human judgment" (literally, "may subject every human day to me").

Ἐπικαλοῦμαι is the normal Greek word for "invoke," "call upon," but with *ὄνομα* as object it is Jewish and Christian,[5] and *ἅγιος* as an epithet of God is in general Oriental, and especially Semitic.[6] The Name, which in Jewish contexts often stands for God,[7] is appropriately called *ἅγιος* and *μέγας*.[8] The circumstance that the Hebrew expresses the superlative by other means than inflection may at least partly account for the fact that neither God nor his name is called *μέγιστος* in the Septuagint version of the canonical books, but we have *μέγιστος* as an epithet of *θεός* in II Macc. 3.36, III Macc. 1.9 (the reading of V), 16, and elsewhere. In PGM II, 127, *δῶρόν μοι ἐδωρήσω τὴν τοῦ μεγίστου σου ὀνόματος γνῶσιν,* the adjective probably does not merely express greatness in a high degree, but means the greatest name by which the god could possibly be called. Comparison with that text might seem to lend our coin inscription the color of pagan magic; but the invocation of the Name (God) *ἵνα μοι συνεργῇ* preserves the Jewish atmosphere.

However, the formula of the reverse is distinctly pagan in its associations. The verb *ὑποτάσσω* is used in charms intended to subject demons or human beings to the operator's will, as in PGM V, 164–165, *ὑπόταξόν μοι πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια*; P. Masp. 188, 3, *ὑπόταξόν μου πᾶν* $\overline{\text{πνα}}$ *δαιμονίων*; PGM X, 50, *ὑπόταξόν μοι τὸν δεῖνα*; V 324, *ὑποτεταγμένος δέ μοι ἤτω.*

The special interest of this amulet lies in *πᾶσαν ἀνθρωπίνην ἡμέραν,* which is a reminiscence of the words of the Apostle Paul in 1 Cor. 4.3,

[4] Larfeld, p. 495; O. Guéraud, Bull. soc. arch. Alex. 32 (1938), 21.

[5] E.g., Gen. 4.26, Ps. 116.17, 1 Cor. 1.2.

[6] E. Williger, Hagios (RGVV 19,1), esp. 80–108.

[7] Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch, II, 316; McCasland in JBL 68, p. 109.

[8] Ps. 33. 31; 76.1; 111.9; 1 Clem. 58, 64; Herm. Vis. 4.1.3.

ἐμοὶ δὲ εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν ἵνα ὑφ' ὑμῶν ἀνακριθῶ ἢ ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας. In AV and RV they are rendered "But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment"; the last words are translated "by any human court" in the American Revised Standard Version. The commentators, ancient and modern, have recognized, as Robertson and Plummer say in the International Critical Commentary, that the phrase is in contrast to ἡμέρα (3.13), which means "the Day of the Lord," "the Lord's Judgment Day." That is confirmed by the use of "the Day of Jahveh" in the Old Testament, and the opposition of divine to human judgment was common in Jewish thought.[9]

One might conjecture that the word ἡμέρα had developed, even in secular texts, the meaning of a day of special importance, "day of judgment," "court day." In fact, that was suggested by Robertson and Plummer, and Liddell-Scott-Jones seem to approve the suggestion when they add, after the reference to 1 Cor. 4.3, another in which they apparently interpret ἡμέραι as "tribunals." This, however, may be only an ambiguity arising from the arrangement of the references, for in the text cited, an inscription from Pamphylia, ἡμέραι means "days of festivity." [10]

Under the sub-heading "gerichtlicher Verhandlungstag" Preisigke cites several examples,[11] none of which, upon inspection, warrants the assumption that ἡμέρα alone can mean "a day in court" unless the context makes the meaning clear, as when in one of his examples there is an allusion to the second day of a trial. In the other instances ἡμέρα, ἡμέραι mean simply day or days needed for preparation of a case, or else they refer to an interval in the proceedings. I have found nothing to show that ἡμέρα alone is a Greek way of saying "day of judgment," "court," or "tribunal." This may account for Jerome's strange notion that 1 Cor. 4.3 is an example of a Cilician provincialism; [12] the use of ἀπό, which his copy apparently read in place of ὑπό (since the former stands in the manuscripts of his letters), would scarcely have disturbed him. The Pelagian commentary wrongly attributed to Jerome [13] paraphrases correctly, "humanum iudicium nullius duco momenti," and Jerome undoubtedly understood the passage even though he found the idiom strange.

In the absence of evidence that an ordinary Greek of Roman times would readily understand ἀνθρωπίνη ἡμέρα as a human tribunal, we are led to conclude that the writer of the amulet text was familiar with the

[9] See Strack-Billerbeck, III, p. 336.
[10] Jahreshefte des öst. Inst. 23, Beiblatt 93–94.
[11] Wörterbuch der griech. Papyrusurkunden.
[12] Epist. 121. 10.4 (CSEL 56, p. 42).
[13] In Texts and Studies IX, 2, p. 146.

passage in Paul's letter. His use of it would be all the more natural if a Jewish training had accustomed him to the contrast, implicit in Paul's words, between a human court and God's Day of Judgment. He was probably a Jewish Christian who had not given up the language, perhaps not even the practice, of magic.

Since the foregoing paragraphs were written A. D. Nock has called my attention to Romans 8.28, *τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν*, where I had overlooked the fact that a strongly held opinion, in fact the now prevailing one, understands *θεός* as the subject of *συνεργεῖ* and *πάντα* as its object. With that interpretation it would appear that the phrase of the Seyrig amulet, *ἵνα μοι συνεργῇ πάντα*, may be another Pauline reminiscence. It would scarcely be convincing in itself, but it gives welcome support to the inference drawn from *ἀνθρωπίνην ἡμέραν*.

It is unfortunate that so little is left of the reverse design that it cannot be positively identified. Even if all its details could be recognized it would give little help towards dating the inscription. A coin chosen for conversion to an amulet would probably have circulated for many years, since a piece already worn smooth would naturally be preferred to one fresh from the mint. A denarius of Hadrian struck in an eastern mint has on its reverse a galley moving to the right;[14] such a coin might have provided the metal for this amulet.

CAMPBELL BONNER

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[14] H. Mattingly, Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, III, Pl. 68, 19; date ca. A.D. 125–128.

THE SILENCE OF BISHOPS IN IGNATIUS

Among the many remarkable features of Ignatius' letters there is perhaps nothing more curious than his peculiar ideas about the value attaching to silence. There is something almost comic in his insistence that when a bishop is saying nothing he is then to be regarded with special awe. It is apparently his firm conviction that the best thing a bishop can do is to refrain from speech altogether. The purpose of this brief note is to attempt an interpretation of the passages where he brings forward this notion, and to suggest that the explanation of them in the standard commentators upon Ignatius' epistles is not satisfactory.

We may start with the well-known words in his letter to the Church at Ephesus. Ignatius exhorts them to be submissive to their bishop Onesimus and to renounce all separatist tendencies. He continues:

> And the more anyone sees a bishop to be silent, the more reverence should he feel towards him. For anyone who is sent by the master of the house for the administration of his household ought to be received by us as him who sent him. Obviously, therefore, the bishop is to be regarded as the Lord Himself. (Ephes. vi.1.)

The value of silence in a bishop emerges again in the letter to the Church at Philadelphia. Referring to their bishop, whom he does not name, Ignatius says:

> I recognized that your bishop obtained the ministry of the community not of himself, nor through men,[1] nor with any desire for vain glory, but in the love of God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. I am amazed at his moderation; when he is silent he is more powerful than those who speak. (Philad. i.1.)

Some light is thrown on Ignatius' meaning by a curious passage in the Ephesian letter where he is exhorting the Ephesian Church to be on its guard against false professions of faith:

> It is better to be silent and to be than to speak and not to be. Teaching is a good thing if the speaker does what he says. Now there is one teacher who 'spake and it came to pass.' (Psalm xxxii.9.) But what He has done also in silence is worthy of the Father. He who really possesses Jesus' word is able also to hear His silence, in order that he may be perfect, so that he may act through his words and may be known through his silences. (Ephes. xv.)

It is interesting to see what the commentators make of this remarkable notion of the virtues of episcopal silence. Lightfoot takes this last passage as "an indirect defence of their bishop Onesimus, on whose

[1] An allusion to Paul, Gal. i.1.

quiet and retiring disposition men were apt to presume." [2] Similarly Bauer in commenting upon Ignatius' words in Ephes. vi observes that the passage is best understood on the supposition that the bishop of Ephesus did not happen to possess the gift of eloquence.[3] That such explanations cannot be said to be really satisfactory is suggested by a consideration of the train of thought in Ephes. vi, the first passage quoted above. Bauer's interpretation really falls to the ground because it fails to answer the question why indeed the silences of a bishop should be taken as evidence that he is to be regarded as the Lord Himself. For it is precisely Ignatius' argument here that it is the silence of the bishop which reveals him to be the representative and plenipotentiary of God. If we accept explanations such as those of Lightfoot and Bauer it is hardly possible to see any sequence in the argument.

Accordingly, it may be suggested that there is room for an alternative proposal, and I would venture to advance the view that the problem may be solved by considering Ignatius' conception of the bishop's position and the ground of his authority. It is well known that in contrast to Clement of Rome and the general tradition of the Roman Church in the second century, Ignatius shows no knowledge of any doctrine which would base the authority of the bishop upon Apostolic Succession. He founds his assertion of the absolute necessity of obedience to the bishop, not upon the opinion that he is successor to the apostles, but upon the notion that he is the earthly representative of God, the very τύπος θεοῦ. The bishop, he tells the Magnesians, presides as the counterpart of God (εἰς τύπον θεοῦ), and the presbyters as the counterpart of the council of the apostles, together with the deacons who have the diaconate of Jesus Christ (Magn. vi.1). Similarly he writes in the Trallian letter (iii) "the bishop is the counterpart of the Father, and the presbyters are as the council of God and the band of the apostles." The whole foundation of Ignatius' position is the view that the earthly Church is nothing less than a microcosm in which the relationships of the heavenly hierarchy are to be found reflected. Thus, "as the Lord did nothing without the Father, either by Himself or through the apostles, so also in your case do nothing without the bishop and the presbyters" (Magn. vi). "Let all of you follow the bishop as Jesus Christ followed the Father, and the presbytery as the apostles" (Smyrn. viii). "Let us be careful not to oppose the bishop, in order that we may belong to God by submitting to him" (Ephes. v).

[2] J. B. Lightfoot, The Apostolic Fathers, Part II, 2nd ed. (1889) ii p. 69.

[3] W. Bauer in the Ergaenzungsband to Lietzmann's Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (1920) p. 206: "versteht sich am besten von der Annahme aus, dass dem Bischof von Ephesus die Rednergabe versagt war."

It is evident from such passages as these that Ignatius is dominated by this conception. As Dr. James Moffatt remarked, "nothing could be more explicit; the jurisdiction of the bishop and his staff has its prototype in heaven." [4] And it is perhaps worth noting that when the importance of this idea is seen, it becomes easy to understand why Ignatius exhorts the Roman Christians to pray for the Syrian Church "which has God for its shepherd instead of me" (Rom. ix.1). This is not to be understood as a naive utterance by a man who imagines himself indispensable, as B. H. Streeter urged.[5] It is simply another application of his view of the Church. Now that the earthly bishop is no longer present, God the Father, who is his heavenly counterpart, remains in charge of his flock.

This doctrine that the bishop is the earthly representative of the divine prototype leads Ignatius to attribute to the bishop the characteristics that he predicates of God. It is generally recognized that Ignatius' vocabulary [6] and thought-world have marked affinities with the gnostic movement, and that this is particularly in evidence in his attribution to God of silence, σιγή. We may recall that in the Valentinian system the ultimate deity is conceived as a dyad, *Bythos* and *Sige*, who form the first pair of Aeons in the ogdoad.[7] And the association of *Sige* with God also occurs in the magical papyri where the aid of "silence" is invoked as being a "symbol of the living, incorruptible God." [8] Ignatius' kinship with these ideas is shown by his description of Christ as the "Logos which came forth from silence" (Magn. viii.2), and in the famous vision of the star in Ephes. xix where the virginity of Mary, her childbearing, and the Lord's death are "three mysteries proclaimed aloud, which were wrought in God's silence."

Silence being therefore a primary characteristic of God Himself, Ignatius is led by his theory that the bishop is the earthly counterpart of the divine archetype to his notion that the silence of the bishop is a matter of the profoundest significance. God is silence; therefore when men see their bishop silent, the more reverence should they feel towards

[4] See his article 'An Approach to Ignatius,' in the Harvard Theological Review XXIX (1936) at p. 35. The point is also made by A. Ehrhardt, 'The Beginnings of Monepiscopacy' in the Church Quarterly Review CXL (1945) pp. 113–126.

[5] The Primitive Church (1929) p. 170.

[6] Compare the remark of Dr. W. L. Knox in his recent book, The Acts of the Apostles (1948) p. 48 n. 1: "Ignatius' Greek is largely made up of . . . reminiscences of the N.T.; the rest comes from pagan religion and astrology."

[7] Cf. Irenaeus, adv. Haer. 1.11.1; 2.12.2. Clement, Exc. Theod. 29.

[8] Papyri Graecae Magicae iv.559, ed. Preisendanz i p. 92. Further material is collected by H. Schlier, Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen (= Z.N.W. Beiheft 8, 1929) p. 37 f. I have not seen H. W. Bartsch, Gnostisches Gut und Gemeindetradition bei Ignatius von Antiochien (1940).

him, for it is then that he is most like God. And if he should preach, his sermon might perhaps be considered as a "Logos proceeding from silence." Ignatius has taken over the familiar Hellenistic conception that things on earth correspond to things in heaven (a notion thoroughly characteristic of gnosticism, at least in its Valentinian form), and has applied it whole-heartedly to his conception of the Church and its ministry. If this interpretation of the passages in Ephesians and Philadelphians is correct, it shows the astonishing extent to which Ignatius took perfectly seriously both his theory that relationships in the earthly Church are a reflection of the state of things in the heavenly hierarchy, and also his semi-gnostic conception of God as Silence. Whether there are elements of permanent value in his opinion concerning the virtue of episcopal silence it is beyond the scope of this paper to determine.

Henry Chadwick

Queens' College
Cambridge, England

SIGNA IMPERII ON AN AMULET

A haematite amulet against colic, belonging to the National Museum at Copenhagen and published in Symb. Osl., XIX, 76 f. (Fig. 2), has increased in interest since Campbell Bonner studied the type closely and on important points corrected my own interpretation, Harvard Theological Review, XXXV, 87 ff., XXXVII, 333 f. The place of origin of these amulets is Syria; the Michigan specimen discussed by Bonner derives from Aleppo and has been republished by P. R. Mouterde (Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph, XXV (1942–43), 112, no. 20, see ib., pl. 7, no. 20): "Dieu imberbe, nu, à g., debout sur une base moulurée; il porte une besace sur l'épaule g. et dresse la droite. Au pied de la base, à g., aigle éployé tourné vers le dieu. Dans le champ, à g., signe indistinct, astérisque et une lettre ou deux lettres liées, △, ou ⁞ △, ou △ ⁞. Une palme, au sommet et à dr., encadre la scène." This Michigan specimen reproduces only one half of the original figuration, as we conclude from the Copenhagen specimen. If we follow the suggestion of Campbell Bonner, p. 87, we may guess that the original colic-amulet has been bisected, in order to make two equally good amulets "against colic" — in fact the design divides itself into two independent parts. The right one represents the "*Marsyas*" of the Forum Romanum, as H. Seyrig saw, referring to Hill's publication of the Palestine coins in the Brit. Mus., Cat., Nos. 118–120 (see Campbell Bonner, l.c., p. 334.) The left part represents an eagle with its wings folded (not "éployé," as Mouterde takes it), probably carrying a thunderbolt in its claws (cf. the Copenhagen specimen.) Behind and above the eagle of "Jupiter" the lapidary has placed a garland (Campbell Bonner's observation.) Again, *above* the eagle, we see a *sella curulis*, turned upside down, evidently in view of heraldic considerations. The garland is to be completed as a laureate crown, placed on the *sella*, or the throne. The "strange geometrical design" which appears over the eagle cannot mean the peak, or peaks, of Mount Gerizim, near Neapolis Samariae, as M. Seyrig thought, referring to Hill's Introduction, l.c., p. XXV, etc. The design of Mount Gerizim in the coins has quite a different appearance (cf., e.g., Athenian coins with Parthenon on the Acropolis, coins from Heliopolis, etc.) The free towns in the East which found it to their interest to give prominence in this way to their *ius Italicum*, made use of a most important symbolism which emphasized the dominion of

the *imperator* and the *populus Romanus* (cf. my article, Trône et Sceptre, in, From the Collections of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, vol. III (1942), 189–201.) There is a whole series of reliefs of this type. On the Copenhagen relief (see Fr. Poulsen's Katalog [1940], no. 817) the two youths who support the *sella* may be the Dioscuri, as L'Orange, who is engaged on the study of the symbols of sovereign power and apotheosis, informs me. (The high-placed "legs" are the supports of the *sella*.) An excellent specimen of such thrones as objects of cult is a marble relief at Mantua where the *regalia* of Jupiter in the sky (simultaneously representing Jupiter on earth — the Imperator) are portrayed: on a magnificent *sella*, topped on either side by kneeling giants, is spread the *purpura* on which lies a mighty thunderbolt, and behind this a transverse sceptre is visible. The left part of the throne is hidden by a big eagle, looking r.[1] The majesty of the throne, "*the thrones*," is emphasized by Antiochos of Commagene (ca. B.C. 50) by use of the plural. This king hopes that his soul shall ascend *πρὸς οὐρανίους Διὸς Ὡρομάσδου θρόνους* (Ditt. O.G.I., no. 383.41.) His own *θρόνοι* are mentioned ib. l. 25, likewise in the plural. We may call such a plural a *pluralis elativus* (commonly named *plur. maiestatis*; Havers, S. Ber. Ak. Wien, vol. 222 [1946], 3, p. 173 labels it *pluralis honorificus*), cf. Soph. O. C. 425 *ὃς νῦν σκῆπτρα καὶ θρόνους ἔχει.* To such "elation" the said marble relief gives expression through its dimensions and overdecoration; hymns do the same through the plurality of attributes of the deity invoked, magic formulas through identification with other deities without number, cult through numerous repetitions of the same image of god or king and through numerous altars dedicated to the same deity. From the magical papyri we quote, e.g., P.G.M. V.41: *ἀπόλυσις· χώρει κύριε* (i.e., Serapis, identified with Zeus, Helios and Mithra) *εἰς τὸν ἴδιον κόσμον, εἰς τοὺς ἰδίους θρόνους* (it is indeed hard to see why Coloss. i. 16, *θρόνοι* is constantly translated "angelic thrones.") At the same time we are reminded of the plural Mk. 6.14, (Herodes) *ἔλεγεν ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ* ("these extraordinary powers," Goodspeed). Possibly Lk. 8.27, *ἀνήρ τις . . . . ἔχων δαιμόνια*, may be subsumed under this head, in view of ib. v. 29, *τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ*, but in fact this special demon represented a whole "legion"

[1] Cook, Zeus 2, 812, fig. 778. On "thrones" see ib. 1, 124 ff. and 596 ff. (Zeus Tersios of Cilicia); ib., p. 810 ff., bronze coins of Diokaisareia (Zeus + Kaisar!) in Cilicia — part of them are struck by Philippus Iunior, which is relevant in view of the chronology of the coins from Neapolis Samariae and the haematites here in question (Mionnet, Déscr. 3.577 f., no. 197.) On sceptre-cult see Cook, l.c., 2. 1132, cf. Cary-Nock, Class. Quart. 21 (1927), p. 123.

of demons (cf. the 7 demons of Mary of Magdala), and it is better to leave it out of this context.

On the Copenhagen haematite the sky is represented by a crescent between two stars, and in the field below a third star is visible. We here have to bear in mind that the oriental influence of the star-cult in general — and especially the moon-cult of Syria with its luni-solar calendar — was doubly important in these times (probably middle of 3rd century A.D.) of predominant astrology.[2] Under any circumstances the design of the haematite is to be interpreted as a coherent whole where *regalia*, "Marsyas" and the sky are fused in a higher unity. This unity, representing a concentration of δύναμις *sans comparaison*, has been to a cunning magician a welcome talisman against colic! Πρὸς κωλάνεμον, as the inscription of the Copenhagen haematite reads. No doubt, colic gave — and gives — excruciating pain (Cels. IV. 21, *vehementes dolores*, compare the bulky chapter in Marcell. de med. XXIX, p. 227–235 Niedermann), and we also hear of Roman emperors (e.g. Tiberius) being especially tortured by these pangs. However such a unity of representative resistance gives us a little surprise. Since Pharaonic times *regalia* had been used as apotropaea for common people too. Even so this special application of the die and the date are worthy of further examination. Against Campbell Bonner's acute observation that the sack of "Marsyas" has been interpreted as the wind-bag of Aeolus (Harvard Theological Review XXXV, p. 89, cf. the rule of magic, ὁ τρώσας καὶ ἰάσεται) may be objected that in all likelihood this myth, and such a special application o[c] it to the ἄνεμος of the patient, were unknown to ordinary lapidaries who made this kind of amulet; and, as remarked above, the design of the haematites here dealt with is *as a unit* mobilized against the suffering.

Finally a few words on the inscriptions of amulets against diseases may not be superfluous:

(1) The disease is addressed; e.g.: φύγε, Ποδάγρα, Περσεύς σε διώκει (on a St. Petersburg gem, quoted by Campbell Bonner, p. 90); agate in the Brit. Museum no. 56188, SINE ME [AE]STUS ("Let me alone, Fever") now suitably supplied and interpreted by Mouterde, l.c., p. 113, no. 20.

(2) The part of the body or the organ suffering is addressed, e.g.: Ἀναχώρει, κολε (prb. for χολή [χόλε, rare epic form?]), τὸ θιόν σε διώκει

[2] Cook, Zeus, 1. 731 ff.; Cumont, Les rel. or. (4th ed.), p. 118 f.; cf. Nilsson, Arch. f. Rel., 30.143.

inscription of a gem in the Cabinet des médailles,[3] cf. Marcell. XIV. 67, . . . *fuge, Uva ne cancer te comedat*; XV.101, (*carmen mirum ad glandulas sic: Albula Glandula, nec doleas nec paranychia facias*, etc.). From the N.T. we quote Mk. 7.34 (Jesus, looking up to heaven and sighing, addresses the ears to be opened and the tongue to be released), Ἐφφαθά (which means "open.") Compare P. Osl. 1. 316, where you have to address the door to be opened (in Coptic): Ανων νηϊ, ανων νηϊ, τκελλι.[4]

(3) The deity, the demons or the formulas are invoked, e.g.: Στῆσον τὸ αἷμα (here it may be that a demon is invoked; haematite, published by Preisendanz, Festschr. Poland [1932], col. 101 ff.) Cf. a bronze disc (published by Mouterde, l.c., p. 122 f., no. 55): Σφραγὶς Θ(εο)ῦ ζῶντος (sic), φύλαξον ἀπὸ παντὸς κακου τὸν φοροῦντα τὸ φυλακτήριον τοῦτο.

(4) By order of God (or of the demons) the amulet forbids the morbific cause, e.g.: Θεὸς κελεύει μὴ κνεῖν κόλον πόνους, a recipe against colic, Marcell. XXIX. 23.[5] Compare Plin., n.h. XXVI. 93 (formula to be used against *pani*, abscesses): *Negat Apollo pestem posse crescere cui nuda virgo restinguat*. The same formula is recognizable, as it seems, in Peter's cure of the paralytic Aeneas at Lydda, Acts 9:34, Αἰνέα, ἰᾶταί σε Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ἀνάστηθι καὶ στρῶσον σεαυτῷ.

(5) A different formula, the most generally used in Christian times, but antique in origin is St. Paul's command, directed against the foul spirit, the Python, Acts 16.18: παραγγέλλω σοι ἐν ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐξελθεῖν ἐξ αὐτῆς (the slave-girl at Philippi.) This formula had already in Jesus' lifetime increased the stock of formulas of Jewish exorcists, and apparently was not forbidden by the Lord himself. Mk. 9.38 f. (with the ἐξουσία he did not hand over any fixed formula to the disciples, Mk. 3.14, prls.).[6]

(6) The object for which the amulet is to be useful is simply indicated (cf. labeled "for sale"), e.g.: Ἰσχίων, "for (belonging to) the hips" (i.e., against sciatica),[7] Πρὸς κωλάνεμον (on the Copenhagen haematite, see supra). The relative chronology of these types, which since antiquity have been used side by side, and their origin may well deserve further study. The influence of old Babylonian and Chaldaean demonology is an important fact.

[3] Lenormant, Rev. arch. 3, 1st. series, (1846), p. 510; Schlumberger, R.E.G. 1892, p. 14 ff.; Mouterde, l.c., p. 112, no. 18.

[4] See Commentary ad loc., p. 116 f.

[5] Symb. Osl. 19, p. 76.

[6] Cf. a forthcoming fasc. supplet., of Symb. Osl., no. 12.

[7] H. Seyrig, Berytus 1 (1934), 10–11; 2, 50. Mouterde, l.c., p. 107, no. 1.

Postscript.

After the foregoing remarks had been sent to the editor, H. P. L'Orange drew my attention to an important study of four marble reliefs from Steiermark and one from Pettau (Pannonia), published by Erna Diez, Österreich, Jahresh. 36 (1946), pp. 96–112 (with ill.). They all show a *sella curulis* on a large scale, surmounted by a cushion on which an imposing *corona laurea* (in one case *corona quernea*) is placed. A relief from Waltersdorf (ill. 24) is especially interesting: the crown is supported (or is placed on the cushion) by two *camilli*, flanked on either side by a lictor with *fasces laureati* and a *scriba* with documents. For all details see the article by Erna Diez (who now *inter alia* has interpreted conclusively — probably for the first time — the design of the legs of the folding campstool). The conclusion arrived at is this (p. 107): These are sepulchral monuments of municipal officials ("Beamte autonomer Städte"), in one case (the Waltersdorf relief) of a *duovir iure dicundo*. We may here refer to a relief from Nuceria, Dessau no. 6446 (has the Cilli relief, fig. 27, been imported from Italy?). At any rate the prototype, exhibiting the extraordinary honor of being invested with a *sella curulis* and crowned with a *corona laurea* (*quernea*) — these two acts are mutually interdependent (cf., e.g., the Waltersdorf relief) — must have been an Italian one. The *ritual* prototype may perhaps be retraced to imperial honors (cf. the *signa triumphalia*); the relief from Nuceria was found below Vesuvian ashes. In this connection the representation of thunderbolts (Cilli) and weapons (Leibnitz, i.e. Flavia Solva) as ornaments of the seat may not be irrelevant. The relief from Altenmarkt (Diez, loc. cit., p. 103, ill. 29) probably is to be discarded. The working up of the whole numismatic material will considerably help us to solve all the problems relating to the reliefs in question (on coins of Vespasian we see a winged thunderbolt lying on a *draped* stool, Cook, Zeus, part 2, p. 809).

S. Eitrem

Oslo University

CORRIGENDUM

Volume XLIII (1950), page 57, note 67.

In the article "Paul of Constantinople," Section IV and the sentence to which Note 67 refers, the words "northwards" and "for delivery on the coast of Asia Minor" should be deleted. Père Peeters merely argues that the raft afforded escape from Tyre. In the first instance, Athanasius was carried away from his goal.

Seventh Congress for the History of Religions

The Seventh Congress for the History of Religions will be held at Amsterdam from September 4th to September 9th, 1950. Those who desire to take part should write to the Secretary, Professor C. J. Bleeker, Churchill-laan 290–I, Amsterdam.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Die Abendmaph Isworte Jesu. *Von D. Dr. Joachim Jeremias.* Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949. 128 p.

Aggee. Zacharie. Malachie. *Traduits par Albert Gelin.* Paris, Editions du Cerf, 1948. 70 p.

As A Mighty Stream. The progress of Judaism through history. *By Julian Morgenstern.* Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 5710–1949. 442 p.

Aus Frühchristlicher Zeit. *Von Hans Joachim Schoeps.* Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1950. 320 p.

The Chant. *By V. G. L. Tournai,* (Belguim) 1949. 126 p.

Christ and Time. *By Oscar Cullmann.* Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1950. 253 p. $5.00

Classica et Mediaevalia. *Publiée par Franz Blatt.* Vol. X, Fasc. 2, N. Y., G. E. Stechert & Company, 1949.

Collectanea Theologica. Varsaviae, Cura Societatis Theologorum Polonorum., F. 1, 2, 3, 1949

A Critical Study of Primitive Liturgies Especially That of St. James. *By K. N. Daniel.* Tiruvalla, T.A.M. Press, 1949. 267 p. Rs. 8.

The Decline of the Medieval Cistercian Laybrotherhood. *By James S. Donnelly.* N. Y., Fordham University Press, 1949. 95 p.

Dedukcja Naturalna I Logistyczna. *By Józef Iwanicki.* Warszawa, Naktadem Polskiego Tow. Teologicznego w Warszawie, 1949.

Dieu a L'image de L'homme. *Par Frank Michaeli.* Paris, Delachaux et Niestlé, [1950]. 173 p.

Les Epitres de Saint Paul Aux Corinthiens. *Traduites par le Chanoine E. Osty.* Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1949. 33 p.

Les Epitres de Saint Paul Aux Philippiens. A Philemon. Aux Colossiens. Aux Ephesiens. *Traduites par le R. P. P. Benoit.* Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1949. 102 p.

L'Evangile Selon Saint Luc. *Traduit par le Chanoine E. Osty.* Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1948. 145 p.

L'Evangile Selon Saint Marc. *Traduit par le R. P. J. Huby.* Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1948. 83 p.

Ezechiel. *Traduit par P. Auvray.* Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1949. 187 p.

Graecitas Biblica. *A. Maxiliano Zerwick.* Rome, Pontificio Institutio Biblico, 1949. 119 p.

Hat Die Urkirche Die Kindertaufe Geübt? *Von D. Dr. Joachim Jeremias.* Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949. 47 p.

The Heritage of the Reformation. *Ed. by Elmer J. F. Arndt.* N. Y., Richard R. Smith, 1950. 264 p. $3.00.

Hoofdlijnen der Theologie Van Het Oude Testament. *Door Dr. Th. C. Vriezen.* Wageningen, H. Yeenman & Zonen, 1949. 302 p.

How Stands Reunion? *By Edward S. Woods.* London, Lutterworth Press, [1949]. 60 p. 1/6.

Ignatius Von Antiochien und das Johannes-Evangelium. *Von Dr. Theol. Christian Maurer.* Zürich, Zwingli, 1949. 107 p.

L'Institution et L'Evenement. *Par Jean-Louis Leuba.* Paris, Delachaux et Niestlé, [1950]. 141 p.